

December 12, 1974

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to, and that I may revise and extend my own remarks and insert certain extraneous material on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:
I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Fifth Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality.

When future historians look back on the pursuit of environmental quality in our era, they will recognize it as a positive turning point.

As I stated in an Earth Day speech in 1970, "the day is gone when concern for the land, the air and the water was sole province of the conservationist, the wilderness enthusiast, the bird watcher, and the environmental scientist."

Instead, today, millions of our citizens share a new vision of the future in which natural systems can be protected, pollution can be controlled, and our natural heritage will be preserved. The crusade to improve the quality of our human environment has begun—a crusade which has already led to great accomplishment over the past five years.

Another valuable lesson was learned during the energy crisis last winter when, in trying circumstances, it became clear that we cannot achieve all our environmental and all our energy and economic goals at the same time. Had our commitment to the environment not been ingrained, we might have reacted to this situation by discarding our environmental goals. Had our commitment to the environment not been mature, we might not have recognized the need for balance to accommodate other social and economic goals as well. By rejecting the extremes—by accepting the need for balance—we held fast to the accomplishments of the past and looked with new perspective towards the imperatives of the future. This, in my judgment, is the course we must continue to follow.

The need to move toward greater self-sufficiency in energy is one of the major challenges of the decade ahead. We can

and must meet our needs for energy, and in ways that minimize damage to the environment.

The conservation of energy provides an essential common ground between our need for energy and our desire to protect the environment. By eliminating waste in the use of energy, and by increasing the efficiency of the energy we use, we can move toward both goals simultaneously. Our experience this year has shown that there are major opportunities to conserve energy. And we are coming to understand that actions which temper our growing use of energy contribute to self-sufficiency as well as actions which increase our domestic supply.

We must also recognize that, even with a strong conservation program, we will still have to mine more coal, drill for more oil and gas, and build more powerplants and refineries. Each of these measures will have an impact on the environment. Yet this can be minimized, and the last five years have shown that we have the capacity and the willingness to do so. Science and technology, in which America excels, provides one means of limiting environmental damage; careful analysis and planning, with broad public participation, offers another.

Let us also be guided by our increased recognition of the interdependence of all nations of our globe and the fundamental relationship between population, resources, economic development, world stability, and the environment.

No longer is concern for the environment the dream of a few. Instead, it is reflected in countless actions by many citizens, by industry, and by government at all levels every day. The environmental movement has matured, and the nation and its environment have benefited in the process. Looking to the future, we can expect further accomplishment in enhancing our environment and, along with it, further improvement in our quality of life.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 12, 1974.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1975

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 10, 1974.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

(Mr. PIKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1974, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 16136, which is the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization for the Department of Defense and Reserve components.

On September 11, 1974, the Senate considered the legislation, amended it by striking out all language after the enacting clause, and wrote a new bill.

H.R. 16136, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided new construction authorization to the military departments and the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1975 in the total amount of \$2,935,801,000.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, provided new construction authorization in the total amount of \$3,027,925,060.

As a result of the conference between the House and the Senate on the differences in H.R. 16136, the conferees agreed to a new adjusted authorization for military construction for fiscal year 1975 in the amount of \$2,994,878,000. The amount authorized for appropriation, however, is only \$2,984,378,000. The difference results from the fact that two projects authorized, totaling \$10.5 million, do not require appropriations.

The amount of new authority approved is \$294,002,000 below the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

The total authority granted is approximately \$59 million above that granted by the House and approximately \$33 million below the Senate figure.

There were over 150 differences in the House and the Senate versions. However, we were able to arrive at an agreement on each one of these differences. I will not go into a lot of detail because the joint statement of the managers explains the actions of the conferees.

The most difficult problem encountered in the conference with the Senate was the Department of Defense proposal for an expansion of facilities on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. The original Department request, under the Navy portion of the bill, was for \$29 million to upgrade the present facilities on the island of Diego Garcia. Among the projects envisioned was the extension of the runway by approximately 2,000 feet, additional POL storage capacity, and the dredging of the harbor so that larger ships could anchor there. The House approved the Department's request without change. However, the Senate reduced the amount requested and authorized \$14,802,000. Further, the Senate inserted language which would require the President to certify to the Congress that the need for the expansion of facilities had been evaluated by him, and that such projects were essential to the security of the United States, and this certification must be approved by a joint resolution of the House and the Senate.

The House conferees argued that the Senate language, in effect, would allow a legislative veto by inaction and offered compromise language which would permit either the House or the Senate to

December 19, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this has resulted as a compromise with the Senate, and also to provide for judicial review, which is a highly important place in which to decide this issue in view of this indecision that now relates to this matter; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California, let me say that insofar as my recollection is concerned this was unanimously approved by all members of the conference and, not only that, but while the language provides for judicial review, as I said, the lawsuits or judicial review are now going on. It was the determination of all of the conferees that while these lawsuits are pending that this agency should not be financed to stifle the development and growth of our country, while the courts are deciding the issue.

Again while we touched on only one part of the legislative provision, having touched one part of it in the House, then I respectfully suggest all parts of the legislative provision would come before the conference. As I say, we do not prohibit or permanently prevent EPA, but until the courts decide on this issue, we recommend that financing not be made available to EPA, but that the matter be left to the cities and States.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I just say that these regulations insofar as the contracts for airports, highways, shopping centers and sporting arenas are not even effective until next year, the parking which the House acted on was covered, so that they are not germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

There is only one issue involved here and that is whether the amendment included in the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is germane. It obviously is far more comprehensive than the House provision, and is not germane thereto. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

The question was taken.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 90, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]

YEAS—282

Abdnor	Gettys	Pettis
Anderson, Ill.	Ginn	Peyster
Andrews, N.C.	Gonzalez	Pickle
Andrews,	Goodling	Poage
N. Dak.	Gross	Powell, Ohio
Annunzio	Gubser	Preyer
Archer	Gunter	Price, Ill.
Arends	Guyer	Price, Tex.
Armstrong	Haley	Pritchard
Ashbrook	Hammer-	Quile
Bafalis	schmidt	Quillen
Barrett	Hanley	Railsback
Baumman	Hanrahan	Randall
Beard	Harsha	Rarick
Bell	Hastings	Regula
Bennett	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes
Bergland	Heinz	Roberts
Bevill	Henderson	Robinson, Va.
Blaggi	Hicks	Robison, N.Y.
Blackburn	Hinshaw	Roe
Blatnik	Hogan	Roncallo, Wyo.
Boggs	Holifield	Rose
Boland	Holt	Rostenkowski
Bolling	Horton	Rousselot
Bowen	Hammer	Roy
Bray	Hulder	Ruppe
Breaux	Hudnut	Ruth
Brinkley	Hungate	Ryan
Brooks	Hunt	St Germain
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Sandman
Brotzman	Jarman	Sarasin
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Calif.	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Pa.	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Jones, Ala.	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Jones, Okla.	Sebelius
Buchanan	Jones, Tenn.	Shoup
Burgener	Jordan	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	Kazen	Shuster
Burke, Mass.	Kemp	Slak
Burleson, Tex.	Ketchum	Slask
Burrlison, Mo.	King	Skubla
Butler	Kluczynski	Slack
Byron	Lagomarsino	Smith, Iowa
Carney, Ohio	Landgrebe	Snyder
Carter	Latta	Spence
Casey, Tex.	Leggett	Staggers
Chamberlain	Lehman	Stanton
Chappell	Lent	J. William
Clausen	Long, La.	Steed
Don H.	Long, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del.	Lott	Steiger, Wis.
Cochran	Lujan	Stephens
Cohen	McClary	Stubblefield
Collins, Ill.	McCollister	Stuckey
Collins, Tex.	McCormack	Studds
Conlan	McEwen	Sullivan
Corman	McFall	Symington
Cotter	McKay	Symms
Crane	McKinney	Talcott
Culver	Macdonald	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, Dan	Madden	Taylor, N.C.
Daniel, Robert	Madigan	Teague
W. Jr.	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Daniels	Mallory	Thone
Dominick V.	Mann	Thornton
Danielson	Martin, Nebr.	Towell, Nev.
Davis, S.C.	Martin, N.C.	Traxler
Davis, Wis.	Matsunaga	Treen
de la Garza	Mayne	Ullman
Delaney	Mazzoli	Van Deerlin
Dellenback	Meicher	Vander Veen
Denholm	Metcalfe	Vesey
Dennis	Mezvinsky	Vigorito
Dent	Michel	Waggoner
Derwinski	Millford	Walsh
Devine	Miller	Wampler
Dickinson	Mink	Ware
Donohue	Mizell	White
Dorn	Mollohan	Whitehurst
Downing	Moorhead,	Whitten
Dulski	Calif.	Whitnall
Duncan	Mosher	Wiggins
du Pont	Murphy, Ill.	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Murtha	Wilson,
Esch	Myers	Charles, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	Natcher	Winn
Evins, Tenn.	Nelsen	Wright
Fascell	Nichols	Wyatt
Findley	O'Brien	Wylie
Flood	O'Neill	Young, Fla.
Flynt	Owens	Young, Ill.
Foley	Passman	Young, S.C.
Fountain	Patman	Young, Tex.
Froehlich	Patten	Zablocki
Fulton	Pepper	Zwach
Fuqua	Perkins	

NAYS—90

Abzug	Gaydos	Riegle
Adams	Gibbons	Rinaldo
Adabbo	Gillman	Rodino
Anderson,	Green, Pa.	Rogers
Calif.	Gude	Rooney, Pa.
Aspin	Hamilton	Rosenthal
Badillo	Harrington	Rough
Blester	Hawkins	Roybal
Bingham	Hechler, W. Va.	Sarbanes
Brademas	Helstoski	Schroeder
Breckinridge	Holtzman	Seiberling
Brown, Calif.	Karth	Smith, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Stark
Burton, John	Koch	Steele
Burton, Phillip	Kyros	Steelman
Chisholm	McCloskey	Stokes
Clay	McDade	Stratton
Conte	Maraziti	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Meeds	Tiernan
Coughlin	Miniah	Udall
Cronin	Mitchell, Md.	Vanik
Dingell	Mitchell, N.Y.	Waldie
Drinan	Morgan	Whalen
Eckhardt	Moss	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Nedzi	Charles H.,
Ellberg	Nix	Calif.
Fish	Obey	Wolf
Ford	Pike	Wylder
Forsythe	Rangel	Yates
Fraser	Rees	Yatron
Frenzel	Reuss	Young, Ga.

NOT VOTING—62

Alexander	Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.
Ashley	Grasso	Mathis, Ga.
Baker	Gray	Mills
Brasco	Green, Oreg.	Minshall, Ohio
Camp	Griffiths	Moakley
Carey, N.Y.	Grover	Montgomery
Cederberg	Hanna	Moorhead, Pa.
Clancy	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Parris
Cleveland	Hays	Podell
Collier	Hebert	Reid
Conable	Hillis	Roncallo, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Howard	Rooney, N.Y.
Dellums	Ichord	Runnels
Diggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipley
Eshleman	Jones, N.C.	Stanton,
Fisher	Kuykendall	James V.
Flowers	Landrum	Vander Jagt
Frelinghuysen	Litton	Wyman
Frey	Luken	Young, Alaska
Gialmo	McSpadden	Zion

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Dellums with Mr. Gray.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. McSpadden.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Moakley with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Montgomery with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Cleveland.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Grasso.
 Mr. Litton with Mr. Fisher.
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Mills with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Kuykendall with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. Mathias of California with Mrs. Griffiths.
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Johnson of Colorado.
 Mr. Minshall of Ohio with Mr. Luken.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Parris.
 Mr. Roncallo of New York with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Young of Alaska.
 Mr. Wyman with Mr. Zion.

veto the proposed construction by passing a resolution of disapproval within 60 days of continuous session of Congress after the President's certification.

After many hours of discussion and many meetings of the conferees, the Senate reluctantly receded to the compromise language, but insisted that additional language be added to the conference report which provides in substance that parliamentary tactics aimed at delaying action on the Senate floor regarding a Resolution of Disapproval will be precluded.

Therefore, after giving a little here and taking a little there, our conferees have done the best they could and believe they have brought to the House a good bill that will provide adequately for the construction needs of the military during this fiscal year. Further, I want to assure the House that all amendments adopted in conference are germane to the bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) for his dedication and assistance during our hearings, and more especially, in the conference. Also, I want this House to know that all members of our conference committee worked long and hard to bring this conference report before you and I urge its adoption.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is perhaps one of the most difficult subcommittees that we have because it entails hours of work and of hearings, and if it had not been for my colleague from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, and his work, and the other Members of the committee and Mr. Shumate's efforts, we would not have reached the bill that we have to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, has explained the details of our conference with the Senate and, therefore, I will not go into the matters already discussed by him and fully explained in the joint statement of the managers.

This bill is not exactly as I would have had it, but then what bill of this magnitude ever is after it has gone through intensive hearings of both the House and the Senate and then the differences are resolved in conference? I recognize that many Members might have desired certain line items which were omitted or conversely, some line items which are included, they might have desired that they be omitted. But, on balance, we are very satisfied with the conference report.

I want to congratulate my colleagues in the conference committee for their dedication and efforts to bring this conference report to the House. Also, I especially want to point out to the Members of the House the excellent leadership provided by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE), that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill H.R. 16136.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1974

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 17597) to provide a program of emergency unemployment compensation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 17597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974".

FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 102. (a) Any State, the State unemployment compensation law of which is approved by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which desires to do so, may enter into and participate in an agreement with the Secretary under this Act, if such State law contains (as of the date such agreement is entered into) a requirement that extended compensation be payable thereunder as provided by the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970. Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing thirty days' written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) Any such agreement shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency compensation—

(1) to individuals who—

(A) (i) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law;

(ii) have exhausted all rights to extended compensation, or are not entitled thereto, because of the ending of their eligibility period for extended compensation, in such State;

(B) have no rights to compensation (including both regular compensation and extended compensation) with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law; and

(C) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of the Virgin Islands or Canada.

(2) for any week of unemployment which begins in—

(A) an emergency benefit period (as defined in subsection (c) (3)); and

(B) the individual's period of eligibility (as defined in section 105(b)).

(c) (1) For purposes of subsection (b) (1) (A), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted his rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(A) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to him based on employment or wages during his base period; or

(B) his rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(2) For purposes of subsection (b) (1) (B), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted his rights to extended compensation under a State law when no payments of extended compensation under a State law can be made under such law because such individual has received all the extended compensation available to him from his extended compensation account (as established under State law in accordance with section 202(b) (1) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970).

(3) (A) (i) For purposes of subsection (b) (2) (A), in the case of any State, an emergency benefit period—

(I) shall begin with the third week after a week for which there is a State "emergency on" indicator; and

(II) shall end with the third week after the first week for which there is a State "emergency off" indicator.

(ii) In the case of any State, no emergency benefit period shall last for a period of less than 26 consecutive weeks.

(iii) When a determination has been made that an emergency benefit period is beginning or ending with respect to any State, the Secretary shall cause notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register.

(B) (1) For purposes of subparagraph (A), there is a State "emergency on" indicator for a week if there is a State or National "on" indicator for such week (as determined under subsections (d) and (e) of section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970).

(ii) For purposes of subparagraph (A), there is a State "emergency off" indicator for a week if there is both a State and a National "off" indicator for such week (as determined under subsections (d) and (e) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970).

(d) For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of the emergency compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to him during his benefit year under the State law; and

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for regular compensation and to the payment thereof shall (except where inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or regulations of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act) apply to claims for emergency compensation and the payment thereof.

(e) (1) Any agreement under this Act with a State shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency compensation, an emergency compensation account.

(2) The amount established in such account for any individual shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 50 per centum of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to him with respect to the benefit year (as determined under the State law) on the basis of which

H 11692

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 12, 1974

he most recently received regular compensation; or

(B) thirteen times his average weekly benefit amount (as determined for purposes of section 202(b)(1)(C) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970) for his benefit year.

(f) (1) No emergency compensation shall be payable to any individual under an agreement entered into under this Act for any week beginning before whichever of the following is the latest:

(A) the first week which begins after December 31, 1974,

(B) the week following the week in which such agreement is entered into, or

(C) the first week which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) No emergency compensation shall be payable to any individual under an agreement entered into under this Act for any week ending after—

(A) December 31, 1976, or

(B) March 31, 1977, in the case of an individual who (for a week ending before January 1, 1977) had a week with respect to which emergency compensation was payable under such agreement.

PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY COMPENSATION

Sec. 103. (a) There shall be paid to each State which has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 per centum of the emergency compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of compensation for which the State is entitled to reimbursement under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act.

(c) Sums payable to any State by reason of such State's having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which would have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

FINANCING PROVISIONS

Sec. 104. (a) (1) Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) of the Unemployment Trust Fund shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, to the extended unemployment compensation account, as repayable advances (without interest), such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Amounts appropriated as repayable advances and paid to the States under section 103 shall be repaid, without interest, as provided in section 905(d) of the Social Security Act.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 105. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the terms "compensation", "regular compensation", "extended compensation", "base period", "benefit year", "State", "State agency", "State law", and "week" shall have the meanings assigned to them under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970;

(2) the term "period of eligibility" means, in the case of any individual, the weeks in his benefit year which begin in an extended benefit period or an emergency benefit period and, if his benefit year ends within such extended benefit period, any weeks thereafter which begin in such extended benefit period or in such emergency benefit period; and

(3) the term "extended benefit period" shall have the meaning assigned to such term under section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970.

For purposes of any State law which refers to an extension under Federal law of the duration of benefits under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, this Act shall be treated as amendatory of such Act.

EXTENSION OF WAIVER OF 120-PERCENT REQUIREMENT FOR PURPOSES OF EXTENDED COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Sec. 106. The last sentence of section 203 (e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, as amended, is amended by striking out "April 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1976".

TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN NATIONAL TRIGGER

Sec. 107. Section 203(d) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning before December 31, 1976, and beginning after December 31, 1974 (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a national 'on' or 'off' indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if the phrase '4.5 per centum', contained in paragraphs (1) and (2), read '4 per centum'."

PROVISION FOR FINANCING TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN NATIONAL TRIGGER

Sec. 108. Section 204(a) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) In the case of compensation which is sharable extended compensation or sharable regular compensation by reason of the provision contained in the last sentence of section 203(d), the first paragraph of this subsection shall be applied as if the words 'one-half of' read '100 per centum of'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious at this point that this Congress must act on temporary unemployment compensation to take the edge off the burden of increased unemployment and to relieve the suffering that is resulting from long-standing unemployment in certain areas.

The Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Ways and Means have, after consultation, worked out an understanding whereby our committee will move in the areas of jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and insofar as noncovered employment is not presently covered, committee will take care of that problem in its bill.

However, this agreement in no way indicates that the Committee on Ways and Means is relinquishing jurisdiction over the subject matter of extending application of the unemployment compensation program to persons whose employment is not presently covered.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I am happy to yield to my friend, the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, I wish to concur in the statement the gentleman just made to the House. It is the understanding of our committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, that their yielding jurisdiction on this point is done for the purpose of consideration of the next bill which is coming up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. We are in perfect accord, and we have a fine working arrangement. There is no misunderstanding here.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is in lieu of and replacement for a bill reported last week to establish a temporary special unemployment compensation program. The bill presently under consideration differs in several respects from the bill that the committee reported last week (H.R. 17570). The principal differences between the two bills are as follows.

First, the earlier bill would have established a program to pay special unemployment compensation both to persons exhausting regular and extended unemployment compensation benefits and to unemployed persons who had worked in noncovered employment. The bill under consideration is limited to providing benefits to persons who were entitled to benefits under the unemployment compensation programs.

Second, the special unemployment compensation program established by the earlier bill would have triggered into operation on an area-by-area basis. The bill under consideration provides that emergency benefits under the new program will be payable whenever extended benefits are payable in a State or in the entire country under the State and National trigger procedures of the Federal-State extended unemployment compensation program.

H 11566

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

There was only one arrest of an American for cocaine importation from late August to Nov. 1 of this year.

The Mexicans have also arrested a small number of other foreigners at the airport for cocaine importation, including six Canadians. According to the U.S. Embassy, no Mexican has been arrested at the airport for this offense.

The airport campaign has revealed some details about the involvement of American DEA agents in the work of Mexico's anti-narcotics program. The U.S. DEA has 36 employees in Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey, Hermosillo, and Mazatlan. Of these, 26 are classified as agents. In addition, DEA agents in U.S. border towns have responsibility for working with Mexican agents in the Mexican border towns.

U.S. officials have seemed reluctant to reveal exactly what these DEA agents do. In a confrontation with American prisoners at Lecumberri prison last July, U.S. Consul General Peter J. Peterson told them, "There are no American police officers attached to the embassy operating in Mexico."

Technically, this is correct, for the U.S. DEA agents do not have the power of arrest in Mexico. But they do perform certain police functions, like taking part in the interrogation of arrested persons and supplying tips to Mexican police officials about suspected offenders.

Even this role might not have been known if it were not for the evident carelessness of one agent. Several American prisoners have said that Americans were present during their interrogations at the airport, but the prisoners did not know who they were. In one case, however, an American identified himself to a prisoner as Arthur Sedillo, a DEA agent attached to the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City.

Faced with this evidence, U.S. Consul General Peterson has confirmed that DEA agent Sedillo, who is no longer in Mexico, was present during that interrogation. But Peterson said he knew of no other case. Regional director Eyman, however, has confirmed that DEA agents have been present in other interrogations.

"There are occasions," Eyman said, "when the government of Mexico will request co-operation or assistance in the interrogation of English-speaking offenders." Eyman said U.S. agents are called in because there is a language problem or the Mexicans need the DEA's "knowledge of what goes on in the United States" or "if we alerted them" to the offender in the first place.

Eyman said "we maintain liaison with the Mexico airport operation" but "there really is no dire need for our presence" in the interrogations.

This involvement of the DEA in the interrogations raises the question of whether the U.S. government has been zealous in protecting the rights of the U.S. citizens arrested in Mexico.

Contrary to international convention, Mexican federal police officials, in almost every case, have refused to allow the American prisoners at the airport to phone the U.S. Embassy for assistance. This has meant that by the time a representative of the office of the consul general, which handles the problems of arrested Americans, has reached a prisoner, he has already signed a confession in Spanish.

With the DEA so closely involved in the airport operation, it would seem a simple matter for the DEA in one part of the embassy building to phone the consul general in another part whenever the DEA knew an American was arrested.

Both Peterson and Eyman insist that this is done as a matter of routine. But, in the one case in March, 1974, the consul general confirms that DEA agent Sedillo was present, embassy records show that the DEA did not

notify the consul general. The consul general's office found out about the case by reading about it in the Mexican newspapers.

In a frank moment, a U.S. Embassy official shed some light on this. "It's an educational thing," he said. "At first, the DEA thought that we were trying to get these kids out of jail. Now they understand the need to cooperate with us."

A number of Americans have accused Mexican officials of beating and torturing them during their interrogations. The U.S. Embassy has passed on 11 such complaints to the Mexican government. The Mexicans have denied the accusations.

Eyman said he does not believe such abuse is taking place. "I would take these allegations with a grain of salt," he said.

But, according to informed sources, Eyman recently sent a letter to all DEA agents ordering them to leave an interrogation if beating or torture took place.

Asked about this, Eyman replied, "If our agents are present when any activity violates the civil rights of any person, we would leave. Our people do not participate or . . . them to post bond and then leave the country. The sentences of 6½ to 13 years received by 50 of the Americans are considered too severe by the Mexican courts to allow bond."

Many prisoners insist that they have paid large fees to lawyers and bribes to court officials to gain freedom, only to be informed later that this was impossible because of U.S. government pressure.

The accusation has troubled the U.S. Embassy enough to solicit a disclaimer from the Mexican Bar Assn.

In a letter to the embassy, Andres Melo Abarrategui, president of the association, said, "We have no knowledge, either official or unofficial, of any intervention by this diplomatic mission on Mexican judicial authorities to prejudice the cases of American citizens on trial in this country on drug charges."

This issue is clouded. On one hand, it is possible that Mexican court officials, knowing the U.S. government is watching them, may be reluctant to deal softly with these prisoners. On the other hand, it is convenient for Mexicans who have accepted large fees or bribes to blame the U.S. government when they fail to do what they have promised . . .

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MILLER's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MILLER's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

STATEMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN AL ULLMAN, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, CONCERNING REQUEST FOR A MODIFIED CLOSED RULE ON THE BILL H.R. 16994, RELATIVE TO THE TAX TREATMENT OF INTEREST ON SAVINGS

(Mr. ULLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this means of addressing my Democratic colleagues in the House to inform

them that the Committee on Ways and Means has directed me to request a hearing before the Rules Committee for a modified closed rule for consideration of H.R. 16994 on the floor of the House. The rule which the committee is requesting would provide for four amendments to be offered on the floor, but otherwise would be the usual type closed rule. These four amendments which might be offered are as follows:

First, the exclusion for interest would expire after 1 year's duration;

Second, the dollar amount of the exclusion could be reduced to some lower dollar figure;

Third, the tax treatment of interest on savings would be made similar to the present tax treatment of series E bonds. Thus, taxation would be deferred until the interest on savings was withdrawn from the account; and

Fourth, the exclusion for interest would be limited to special accounts whose funds are designated specifically for residential mortgages or residential construction loans.

The committee further directed me to request that the rule provide for 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided, waiving points of order, for committee amendments only except for the above, and for the usual motion to recommit.

I am making this announcement in order to comply with rule 17 of the Democratic caucus concerning requests for closed rules or modified closed rules.

I was directed to request the Rules Committee to hold a hearing on this matter next Tuesday, December 17, 1974, and I have so written to the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16136

Mr. PIKE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-1545)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$26,170,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,742,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, \$27,701,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$42,754,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$4,286,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, \$10,270,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$25,933,000.

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11565

(in South America) to put the finger on them in the United States as it is in Mexico," an American narcotics official said. But he added that U.S. officials prefer to alert Mexican authorities because of that nation's tougher enforcement laws.

The DEA is so pleased with the enforcement and conviction record in Mexico that the United States and Mexico, according to a DEA official, plan to utilize an old extradition treaty which is based on Mexican law "that allows for prosecution of Americans in Mexico for crimes committed in the United States."

Interviewed in Washington, Humberto E. Moreno, an official who has coordinated efforts of DEA agents in Mexico, said that the extradition treaty, signed in 1889, has seldom been used. It was used in 1967, he said, when a Mexican citizen who had violated narcotics laws in San Diego was arrested, tried and convicted in Tijuana, Mex. The Mexican was sentenced to five years, Moreno said.

Moreno, praising the Mexican prosecution record, said:

"If we were to put a chart with our prosecution figures on it and the Mexican figures on it, it would show that the Mexicans do much better than our courts on convictions and penalties."

"Mexico has much stiffer narcotics laws and a much stiffer attitude toward enforcing them. The Mexicans are giving defendants six years in cases that we are losing in American courts."

(While the U.S. maximum penalty for possession of narcotics with intent to distribute is 15 years in prison, the average sentence for offenders is 3 to 5 years with the possibility of parole.)

Many of those imprisoned are from California. A large number are educated and articulate people who insist they have been unfairly treated and who have enlisted the aid of relatives and friends to bring their plight to the attention of members of Congress.

With DEA planning to greatly expand its joint enforcement efforts with the Mexican Federal Police, the Los Angeles Times has undertaken an extensive investigation into how that enforcement program has worked so far and how Americans suspected of drug smuggling have fared.

In Mexico City, California and Washington, reporters have sought the facts behind allegations that American suspects have been:

Beaten during interrogation sessions and forced to sign confessions in Spanish by Mexican agents trained by the DEA.

In some instances questioned by Mexican agents accompanied by DEA agents whose presence at such sessions is unauthorized.

Largely ignored by U.S. Embassy officials charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of American citizens arrested in Mexico City.

Exploited by Mexican attorneys and at least one Los Angeles attorney who have preyed on the suspects' friends and relatives, bilking them of many thousands of dollars.

Beaten in prisons that are known for their cruelty, including the notorious Lecumberri prison, where extortion is the rule.

In its investigation, The Times had access to the files of Rep. Fortney H. (Pete) Stark (D-Calif.), who has been working with relatives of many of the prisoners in investigating the situation. Stark, a member of the House's special subcommittee on international narcotics traffic, said in an interview he plans to call for a congressional investigation of the matter.

Stark and his staff have compiled a large file documenting approximately 100 cases, including the treatment of Americans by Mexican police, courts and prisons; allegations about the failure of the U.S. Embassy to assist them, and the role of the U.S. gov-

ernment in the Mexican narcotics enforcement program.

Much of the documentation consists of written statements by prisoners and their relatives.

The arrests at the Mexico City airport have been a special sore point among the American suspects because in their view they have been tried and punished in Mexico for a crime that, in essence, was against the United States.

Robert J. Eyman, the regional director of DEA in Mexico City, said in an interview: "Mexico's ability to interdict this cocaine is a significant step forward as far as the United States is concerned."

An official of the U.S. Embassy here put it in more colorful terms: "It's just like someone was inside your neighbor's house with a bomb that he was going to throw at your house. Wouldn't you be happy if your neighbor stopped him?"

But there is disquiet about the program elsewhere. Numerous Congressmen have written to the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City requesting more information about the plight of the Americans in Mexican jails.

According to the U.S. Embassy here, 528 Americans were imprisoned in Mexican jails as of Nov. 1. Of these, 441 were jailed on narcotics charges. This is more than one-third of all the Americans imprisoned on such charges in foreign jails throughout the world. The U.S. Embassy here says that about 126 were arrested while in transit at the Mexico City airport and charged with importing cocaine into Mexico.

Fifty of the 126 have been sentenced 6½ to 13 years in prison; the others expect a similar fate. The other 316 Americans are serving or will serve, prison terms of 1 or 2 years.

A strong case can be made that most were caught because they were offending a Mexican government genuinely concerned about the problem of drugs within its own country.

But the arrests at the airport of the amateur smugglers—known as "mules" or "burros"—differs in that cocaine is now a major Mexican problem.

Dr. Guido Belasco, the director general of the Mexican center for the Study of Drug Addiction, a government agency, said of cocaine in a recent interview: "There are a few users here. But it is by no means a social problem."

The cocaine arrests represent only part of the results of recent joint American-Mexican efforts to stem the drug traffic. American narcotics agents long believed that part of the American problem would be eased if the Mexican government moved against its drug producers, traffickers and smugglers since Mexico is the source of most of the marijuana and a large part of the heroin used in the United States.

In September, 1969, the Nixon Administration set up "Operation Intercept" at the frontier, in part to bring pressure on the Mexican government. For 10 days, U.S. Border Patrol and Customs agents thoroughly searched every person and car crossing the border from Mexico. The interminable delays disrupted border commerce and held up Mexican workers with jobs in the United States. And it dissuaded U.S. tourists from making trips into Mexico.

Mexico, with the economy heavily dependent upon American tourism, got the message. As a U.S. embassy official said recently, "The United States mechanized its leverage in Operation Intercept, and this sensitized the Mexicans to the problem." The Mexican government agreed to join the U.S. government in "Operation Cooperation"—a program to crack down on the drug traffic from Mexico to the United States.

Under Operation Cooperation, the U.S. government, according to embassy officials, has given Mexico \$14 million in aid for drug-law enforcement, including \$8 million

in the current fiscal year. Most of the money has been spent on 28 helicopters, used by Mexico to hunt for opium poppy fields. In addition, the U.S. government has trained 276 Mexican federal police and 52 customs agents either in the United States or Mexico in drug enforcement and inspection. This means that the vast majority of Mexican federal and customs agents have had such training.

During this period, Mexico has significantly increased its destruction of poppy fields and heroin laboratories and its arrest of traffickers and smugglers, both Mexican and foreign.

The U.S. Embassy does not have statistics prior to Operation Intercept, but one embassy official estimated that the total number of Americans in jail was about 100—most of them for failing to pay their hotel bills. By July, 1970, there were 187 Americans in Mexican jails on drug charges alone. By July, 1971, the figure was 234. Now it is 411.

Despite the Mexican cooperation, there still is a feeling in some U.S. circles that Mexico is not doing enough. During Operation Cooperation, the amount of heroin coming from Mexico increased from 15% to 60%.

In March, 1973, two congressmen, Reps. Morgan F. Murphy (D-Ill.) and Robert H. Steele (R-Conn.), issued a report insisting that "the battle to stop narcotics from entering the United States from Mexico is being lost." They said that "the U.S. Embassy in Mexico must be more forceful in impressing upon Mexican officials that vigorous action is necessary at all levels of government."

In a recent interview, an important Mexican government official said, "There still is considerable pressure; by that I mean normal diplomatic pressure. In fact, a substantial part of the recent talks on the border between the two presidents was on this subject." He was referring to the meetings in late October between President Ford and President Luis Echeverria of Mexico.

There is a difference of opinion among U.S. officials about whether the United States specifically asked for the program to stop cocaine "mules" at the Mexico City airport.

"At no point to my knowledge did we go to the Mexicans and ask for this," a State Department official said in an interview.

Regional Director Eyman of the DEA said, "The United States has encouraged this government and all other governments to improve their enforcement, including airport surveillance. In that sense, we are glad to see it. But did we go out and specifically ask for it? The answer is no."

However, Moreno, the project coordinator of the Mexico program, told The Times, "we motivated it."

Moreno said the program was a gentlemen's agreement between the attorney generals of the two countries.

The Mexican campaign coincided with a training program by the U.S. Customs Service. As part of a worldwide project, U.S. Customs trained two Mexican customs supervisors in the United States in April, 1973, and then sent instructors to Mexico to train 50 customs inspectors in November, 1973. According to U.S. Customs, its training was "oriented towards the practical aspects of seizure, searches, narcotics identification, cargo control, passenger and baggage control, and all other phases of border control enforcement."

In addition, U.S. Customs provided the Mexico City airport in September, 1973, with an American dog handler and a dog trained to sniff narcotics.

The arrests of the Americans at the airport began in late summer of 1973, after the Mexican supervisors returned from training in the United States, and reached its high point in the spring of 1974, after the Mexican customs inspectors had completed their classes. The campaign has since petered out.

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11567

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, \$42,197,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$9,625,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, \$36,827,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, \$12,296,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$8,124,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$9,858,000.
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$1,108,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$19,078,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$2,264,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$9,911,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$11,473,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$17,344,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$3,107,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$3,660,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$7,394,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$4,928,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$15,587,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$3,360,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,497,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, \$1,030,000.
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$541,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$7,648,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$4,726,000.
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$616,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$2,820,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, \$269,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$10,322,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,731,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, \$2,599,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$815,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$717,000.
Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$3,256,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$1,808,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,859,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$556,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$2,023,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$8,720,000.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, \$486,000.
Various Locations, \$19,773,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratories, New Hampshire, \$2,515,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$251,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$1,732,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$1,512,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$15,324,000.
Tripler General Hospital, Hawaii, \$1,205,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,356,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$16,358,000.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

Various Locations, \$10,723,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$557,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$2,034,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

National Missile Range, \$1,272,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY
Various Locations, \$148,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, \$532,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$27,482,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, \$4,159,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$84,000,000: *Provided*, That within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act except for those public works projects concerning which the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000", respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000".

With respect to "Fort Sill, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000".

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of

section 702 "444,767,000;" "117,311,000;" and "562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "447,768,000;" "118,420,000;" and "566,188,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,931,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Clause (1) of section 702 of Public Law 92-145, as amended by section 105(b) of Public Law 93-166, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000" respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$261,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, \$7,232,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$255,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$3,553,000.

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$9,249,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$971,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$7,350,000.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$2,336,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$296,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval District Commandant, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,883,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$205,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$7,706,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$14,943,000.

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, \$15,000,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$290,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$252,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$2,034,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$896,000.

Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$633,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,471,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$8,364,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,990,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,047,000.

H 11568

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

December 10, 1974

Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$15,891,000.
 Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$5,802,000.
 Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$1,595,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$5,893,000.
 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$446,000.
 Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida, \$12,413,000.
 Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$3,239,000.
 Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$3,709,000.
 Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$795,000.
 Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$20,948,000.
 Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,478,000.
 Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,561,000.
 Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$1,485,000.
 Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$7,112,000.
 Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$200,000.
 Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$15,352,000.
 Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,750,000.
 Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,564,000.
 Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,284,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,080,000.
 Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, \$1,830,000.
 Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$1,428,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$1,953,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,619,000.
 Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$8,371,000.
 Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,011,000.
 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$11,772,000.
 Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$12,943,000.
 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$1,048,000.
 Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,238,000.
 Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$13,493,000.
 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, \$8,657,000.
 Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$4,234,000.
 Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$2,147,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, \$1,638,000.
 Naval Hospital, Lemoore, California, \$333,000.
 Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$77,000.
 Naval Communications Station, Stockton, California, \$1,102,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$7,697,000.
 Trident Support Site, Bangor, Washington, \$100,000,000.
 Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, \$393,000.
 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,803,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$795,000.
 Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,505,000.
 Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,356,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, \$1,874,000.
 Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$2,803,000.
 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$13,864,000.
 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,280,000.
 Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$499,000.
 Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$3,203,000.
 Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$1,463,000.
 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,271,000.
 Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$397,000.
 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,849,000.
 Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$44,251,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$3,186,000.
 Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$947,000.
 Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$1,026,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, Canal Zone, \$800,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$1,866,000.
 Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$2,317,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$571,000.
 Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland, \$1,188,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$14,802,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$355,000.
 Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,782,000.
 Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$907,000.
 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$2,873,000.
 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$3,741,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,059,000.
 Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$4,038,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be

inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,359,000" and "\$250,924,000", respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida," strike out "\$3,369,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$247,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000".

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$11,690,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,609,000".

With respect to "Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada," strike out "\$6,003,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,203,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545 is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy," strike out "\$8,832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,632,000".

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,664,000", "\$41,217,000", and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$488,493,000", "\$44,917,000", and "\$533,410,000", respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out \$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,802,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi," strike out "\$4,532,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,466,000".

With respect to "Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana," strike out "\$3,386,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,157,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,758,000".

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000".

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11569

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$522,006,000" and "\$580,839,000", respectively.

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$6,885,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$2,775,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri, \$805,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,894,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$11,150,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$15,873,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,977,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$792,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$9,839,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$13,871,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$4,240,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,100,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$1,198,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$13,512,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$232,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, \$642,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$832,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, \$6,267,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$169,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$7,297,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$298,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$7,885,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,143,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$790,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$836,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$8,631,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$6,798,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$776,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$5,849,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$2,500,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$310,000.

Various Locations, \$15,242,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$14,699,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,155,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$1,373,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$408,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$5,451,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairchild, California, \$8,800,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$1,878,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$641,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$675,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,009,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$2,109,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$1,774,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$323,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$7,050,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$835,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$3,740,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$3,038,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$238,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,595,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$115,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$882,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$6,892,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$1,715,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$3,846,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,565,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,056,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$5,141,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$300,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$6,495,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$730,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$3,948,000.

Various Locations, \$5,194,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$2,056,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$13,700,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$12,152,000.

AEROSPACE CORPORATION

Los Angeles, California, \$9,000,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations, \$138,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$3,775,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$280,000.

United Kingdom, \$884,000.

Various Locations, \$63,081,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$4,135,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$595,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$1,999,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$8,100,000.

Sec. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. (a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado", strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida", strike out "\$1,020,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,284,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE" with respect to "Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri", strike out "\$3,863,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,130,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to "Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia", strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to "Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida", strike out "\$7,039,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi", strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000".

(7) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas", strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000".

(8) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas", strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000".

H 11570

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

(9) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma", strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000".

(10) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas", strike out "\$3,154,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,307,000".

(11) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR-LIFT COMMAND" with respect to "Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma", strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000".

(12) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming", strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000".

(13) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas", strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000".

(14) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada", strike out "\$2,588,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,687,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$280,727,000" and "\$283,029,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center (St. Louis AFS), St. Louis, Missouri, \$2,573,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$670,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,862,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$394,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,399,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$527,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$572,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas, \$646,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$936,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,363,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Johnston Atoll, \$1,458,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family Housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand nine hundred units, \$98,477,900.

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, four hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, one thousand units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, one hundred units.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, one thousand units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, two thousand six hundred and fifty units, \$93,785,980.

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, six hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, three hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand and fifty units, \$35,236,120.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, one hundred units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, one hundred units.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, two hundred units.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, two hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, two hundred and fifty units.

(b) Mobile Home Facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, two hundred and forty spaces, \$960,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$888,000.

(c) Demolition of existing structures on proposed sites for family housing:

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, \$540,000.

SEC. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense

may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation (excluding demolition authorized in section 501(c)), and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$30,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,000,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,000,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 504. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units not subject to the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Total costs shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(a) Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred units, at a total cost not to exceed \$9,600,000.

(b) Two family housing units in Warsaw, Poland, at a total cost not to exceed \$120,000. This authority shall be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

SEC. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$175,500.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, one hundred and forty units, \$2,352,800.

SEC. 507. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed; For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$295 per month for each military depart-

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11571

ment, or the amount of \$365 per month for any one unit."

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676), is amended by striking out "\$325" and "seven thousand five hundred" in the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$355", and "twelve thousand", respectively; and in the second sentence by striking out "three hundred units", and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred fifty units".

SEC. 508. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing and homeowners assistance as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including demolition, authorized improvements to public quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$304,088,000.

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$935,515,000; and

(3) for homeowners assistance under section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

SEC. 509. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the purpose of installing air-conditioning equipment in any new or existing military family housing unit in the State of Hawaii.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3848 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States \$491,695,000; outside the United States \$120,184,000; or a total of \$611,879,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$509,498,000; outside the United States, \$41,458,000; or a total of \$550,956,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$307,786,000; outside the United States, \$74,887,000; section 302, \$8,100,000; or a total of \$390,773,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$28,400,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing and homeowners assistance, \$1,244,603,000.

SEC. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (e), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum

when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum of the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimates of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

(e) In addition to other cost variation limitations contained in this section or in similar sections of prior year military construction authorization Acts, any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this and prior military construction authorization Acts may be varied upward by an additional 10 per centum when the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that such increase is required to meet unusual variations in cost directly attributable to difficulties arising out of the current energy crisis. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

SEC. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of

the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1975, all authorizations for military public works including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(A) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3) (A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(B) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(C) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(D) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(E) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(F) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Fort Ord,

H 11572

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(G) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(H) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137), as amended.

(I) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140), as amended.

(J) Message Center Addition, Aircraft Fire and Crash Station, Aircraft Maintenance Hangar Shops, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Mess Hall, Bachelor Officers' Quarters, Exchange and Recreation Building, and Utilities construction in the amount of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$828,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000, respectively, for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141), as amended.

(K) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), as modified by section 605(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct six hundred family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(a) (2) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148), shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

Sec. 606. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction index is 1.0:

(1) \$31 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$33 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior military construction authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 607. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure "\$150,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000".

Sec. 608. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to assist communities located near the TRIDENT Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such communities, if the Secretary determines that there is an immediate and substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities in such communities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of

the TRIDENT Weapon System and that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by such communities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to communities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such communities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section to any local community for any community service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any such community and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such community, and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

(d) Any funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, for carrying out the TRIDENT Weapon System shall be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1975, for carrying out the TRIDENT Weapon System may, to the extent specifically authorized in an annual Military Construction Authorization Act, be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provision of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs.

(e) The Secretary shall transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives semiannual reports indicating the total amount expended in the case of each local community which was provided assistance under the authority of this section during the preceding six-month period, the specific projects for which assistance was provided during such period, and the total amount provided for each such project during such period.

Sec. 609. (a) Public Law 93-346 (88 Stat. 340), designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, is amended to read as follows: "That effective July 1, 1974, the Government-owned house together with furnishings, associated grounds (consisting of twelve acres, more or less), and related facilities which have heretofore been used as the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, shall, on and after such date be available for, and are hereby designated as, the temporary official residence of the Vice President of the United States.

"Sec. 2. The temporary official residence of the Vice President shall be adequately staffed and provided with such appropriate equipment, furnishings, dining facilities, services, and other provisions as may be required, under the supervision and direction of the Vice President, to enable him to perform and discharge appropriately the duties, functions,

and obligations associated with his high office.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall, subject to the supervision and control of the Vice President, provide for the military staffing and the care and maintenance of the grounds of the temporary official residence of the Vice President and, subject to reimbursement therefor out of funds appropriated for such purposes, provide for the civilian staffing, care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of such residence.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the foregoing provisions of this joint resolution. During any interim period until and before any such funds are so appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate services in connection with the temporary official residence of the Vice President from funds available to the Department of the Navy, subject to reimbursement therefor from funds subsequently appropriated to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

"Sec. 5. After the date on which the Vice President moves into the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution no funds may be expended for the maintenance, care, repair, furnishing, or security of any residence for the Vice President other than the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution unless the expenditure of such funds is specifically authorized by law enacted after such date.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed, with the approval of the Vice President, to accept donations of money or property for the furnishing of or making improvements in or about the temporary official residence of the Vice President, all such donations to become the property of the United States and to be accounted for as such.

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 202 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and (5)' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(5) the temporary official residence of the Vice President and grounds in the District of Columbia; (6) the Vice President and members of his immediately family; and (7)'.

"Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 3056 (a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'protect the members of the immediate family of the Vice President, unless such protection is declined,' immediately after 'Vice President-elect,' and

"(2) inserting 'pay expenses for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and accounted for solely on his certificate,' immediately after 'apprehension of criminals;'

"Sec. 9. It is the sense of Congress that living accommodations, generally equivalent to those available to the highest ranking officer on active duty in each of the other military services, should be provided for the Chief of Naval Operations."

(b) Except as otherwise provided therein, the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective July 12, 1974.

Sec. 610. Section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) Any termination or modification by either the grantor or grantee of an existing license or permit of real property owned by the United States to a military department, under which substantial investments have been or are proposed to be made in connection with the use of the property by the military department."

Sec. 611. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11573

and thereof the following new section and a corresponding item in the analysis:

"§ 2685. Adjustment of or surcharge on selling prices in commissary stores to provide funds for construction and improvement of commissary store facilities

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense, may, for the purposes of this section, provide for an adjustment of, or surcharge on, sales prices of goods and services sold in commissary store facilities.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense, may use the proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) to acquire, construct, convert, expand, install, or otherwise improve commissary store facilities at defense installations within the United States and for related environmental evaluation and construction costs, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design."

SEC. 612. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, proceeds from the sale of recyclable material shall be credited first, to the cost of collection, handling, and sale of the material including purchasing of equipment to be used for recycling purposes and second, to projects for environmental improvement and energy conservation at military camps, posts, and bases establishing recycling programs in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The amount expended for environmental improvement and energy conservation projects shall not exceed \$50,000 per installation per annum. Any balance shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of each military department shall make an annual report to Congress on the operation of the program.

SEC. 613. (a) None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act with respect to any construction project at Diego Garcia may be obligated unless—

(1) the President has (A) advised the Congress in writing that all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia have been evaluated by him, and (B) certified to the Congress in writing that the construction of any such project is essential to the national interest of the United States;

(2) 60 days of continuous session of the Congress have expired following the date on which certification with respect to such project is received by the Congress, and

(3) neither House of Congress has adopted, within such 60-day period, a resolution disapproving such project.

(b) (1) For purposes of this section, the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of such 60-day period.

(2) For purposes of this section, "resolution" means a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the

does not approve the proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia, the need for which was certified to by the President and the certification with respect to which was received by the

on .", the first and second blanks being filled with the name of the resolving House and the third blank being filled with the appropriate date.

(c) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and as such they are deemed

a part of the rules of the Senate, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the Senate in the case of resolutions described by subsection (b) (2) of this section; and they supersede other rules of the Senate only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rules at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

(d) A resolution with respect to a proposed construction project of the island of Diego Garcia shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(e) (1) If the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to which a resolution with respect to a proposed construction project on the island of Diego Garcia has been referred has not reported such resolution at the end of 30 calendar days after its introduction, not counting any day which is excluded under subsection (b) (1) of this section, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution introduced with respect to the same proposed construction project which has been referred to the committee, except that no motion to discharge shall be in order after the committee has reported a resolution of disapproval with respect to the same proposed construction project.

(2) A motion to discharge under paragraph (1) of this subsection may be made only by a Senator favoring the resolution, is privileged, and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution, the time to be divided in the Senate equally between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f) (1) A motion in the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a resolution shall be privileged. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate in the Senate on a resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a resolution shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the resolution, except that in the event the manager of the resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a resolution, debatable motion, or appeal is not debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, a resolution is in order in the Senate.

SEC. 614. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Ozark Public Building Authority, an agency of the city of Ozark, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) for use as a permanent site for the museum referred to in subsection

(c), and subject to the conditions described therein.

(b) The land authorized to be conveyed to the Ozark Public Building Authority as provided in subsection (a) is described as follows: All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in sections 13 and 24, range 23 east, township 5 north, Saint Stephens Meridian, Dale County, Alabama, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which is 216.0 feet north 89 degrees 57 minutes west of the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 24, on the western right-of-way line of Alabama State Highway Numbered 249, and on the boundary of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Fort Rucker Military Reservation;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,395 feet;

thence north 64 degrees 53 minutes west 700 feet; thence south 25 degrees 07 minutes west 2,800 feet; thence south 64 degrees 53 minutes east 700 feet, more or less, to a point which is on the western right-of-way line of said highway and on the boundary of said United States tract;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,405 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 45.00 acres, more or less.

(c) The conveyance provided for by the subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property so conveyed shall be used as a permanent site for a museum to display suitable public exhibits of the United States Army aviation equipment and allied subjects and aviation-oriented exhibits of other United States Government departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and of foreign origin, and if such property is not used for such purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to such real property shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, and to such other conditions as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe to protect the interest of the United States.

SEC. 615. (a) The Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America, for fair market value and subject to such terms and conditions as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America, other than mineral rights including gas and oil which shall be reserved to the United States, in and to a certain parcel of land containing 12.46 acres, more or less, situated in Escambia County, Florida, being a part of the Naval Education and Training Program Development Center, Elyson, Florida, more particularly described as follows:

Commence at the southeast property corner of Naval Education and Training Program Development Center (NETPDC), formerly Naval Air Station, Elyson,

thence north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 725.8 feet more or less to the point of beginning; from said point of beginning, continue north 3 degrees 55 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 829.1 feet more or less to a point,

thence north 0 degrees 27 minutes west along the east boundary of NETPDC a distance of 623.3 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 304.8 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 87 degrees 48 minutes east a distance of 40.5 feet more or less to a point,

thence south 0 degree 25 minutes west a distance of 38.1 feet more or less to a point,

H 11574

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 139.8 feet more or less to a point, thence south 87 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 24.6 feet more or less to a point, thence south 24 degrees 12 minutes west a distance of 17.4 feet more or less to a point, thence south 45 degrees 25 minutes east a distance of 536.6 feet more or less to a point, thence south 44 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 990.1 feet more or less to the point of beginning; containing 12.46 acres more or less.

(b) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary or appropriate carry out the foregoing provisions shall be borne by the Gulf Coast Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Sec. 616. (a) The Secretary of the Army (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), or his designee is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Louisiana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain real property located in Saint Tammany Parish, Louisiana, containing one thousand seven hundred and ten acres, more or less, known as Camp Villere, being the same property presently under license to the State for National Guard use, and known as Audited Installation Numbered 22975 in the files of the Office of the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.

(b) The conveyance required to be made pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made without monetary compensation but shall be in consideration of, and subject to, the following terms and conditions:

(1) The conveyed property shall be used primarily for the training of the Louisiana National Guard and for other military purposes of the Louisiana National Guard.

(2) Any revenue derived by the State from any other uses of the property shall be used for the maintenance and improvement of the property or be shared with the United States as prescribed by the Secretary. The State shall maintain such records and furnish such reports with respect to such revenue as are prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) The State shall protect the timber, water resources, gravel, sand, soil, mineral deposits, and other natural resources of the conveyed property in accordance with sound conservation practices and to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(4) In time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the conveyed property, or any part thereof, is useful or necessary for national defense and security, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, shall have the right to enter upon and use such property, or any part thereof (including any and all improvements made thereon by the State), for a period not to exceed the duration of such war or emergency plus six months. Upon termination of such use, the property shall revert to the State, together with all improvements placed thereon by the United States, and be subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations on its use and disposition which apply without regard to this paragraph. The use of the property by the United States pursuant to this paragraph shall be without obligation or payment on the part of the United States, except that the United States, if required by the State, shall pay the fair market rental value for the use of any improvements on the property which are constructed with State funds and, upon completion of such use, will restore any such improvements to the same condition as that existing at the time of initial occupancy by the United States under this paragraph. At the option of the Secretary, cash payment may be made by the United States in lieu of such restoration; except that the value of any improvements erected by the United States during its occupancy

and left on the property shall be offset against the obligation of the United States to restore improvements constructed with State funds.

(5) There shall be reserved from the conveyance such easements and right-of-way for roads, water flowage, soil disposal, waterlines, sewerlines, communications wires, powerlines, and other purposes, as the Secretary considers necessary or convenient for the operations, activities, and functions of the United States.

(6) All mineral rights with respect to the conveyed property, including gas and oil, shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to permit such reasonable exploration and mining operations as will not interfere with the primary use of the property.

(7) Such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) Upon a finding by the Secretary that the State is violating or failing to comply with any term or condition imposed by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized immediately to reenter and take possession of the property described in subsection (a), whereupon title to such property shall revert to the United States and control thereover may be asserted by the Secretary without any further act or legal proceeding whatsoever. Any improvements, fixtures, and buildings placed on the property by the State during its period of use shall become the property of the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(d) (1) Any surveying and related costs incurred incident to the carrying out of this section shall be borne by the State.

(2) Appropriate provisions to implement the terms and conditions of this Act shall be included in the instrument of conveyance.

Sec. 617. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975".

TITLE VII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$53,800,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$38,600,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$19,867,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$31,500,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$14,000,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. Paragraph (1) of section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000".

Sec. 704. This title may be cited as the

"Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1975."

And the Senate agree to the same.

F. EDW. HEBERT,
OTIS G. PIKE,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
SAMUEL STRATTON,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
CARLETON J. KING,
G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
SAM J. ERVIN,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
JOHN TOWER,
STROM THURMOND,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16136) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the Conferees and recommended in the accompanying report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On August 9, 1974, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 16136 which is the Fiscal Year 1975 Military Construction Authorization for the Department of Defense and Reserve Components.

On September 11, 1974, the Senate considered the legislation, amended it by striking out all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

COMPARISON OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

H.R. 16136, as passed by the House of Representatives, provided new construction authorization to the military departments and the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 1975 in the total amount of \$2,935,801,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate provided new authorization in the amount of \$3,027,925,000.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

As a result of the Conference between the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 16136, the Conferees agreed to a new adjusted authorization for military construction for Fiscal Year 1975 in the amount of \$2,984,378,000.

The Department of Defense and the respective military departments had requested a total of \$3,278,380,000 for new construction authorization for Fiscal Year 1975. The action of the Conferees therefore reduces the Departmental request by \$294,002,000.

CHART.—Total Authorization for Appropriation Granted fiscal year 1975

Title I—Army:	
Inside the United States....	\$491,695,000
Outside the United States....	120,184,000
Subtotal	611,879,000
Title II—Navy:	
Inside the United States....	1,509,498,000
Outside the United States....	41,458,000
Subtotal	1,550,956,000
Title III—Air Force:	
Inside the United States....	307,786,000
Outside the United States....	74,887,000
Sec. 302	8,100,000
Subtotal	390,773,000
Title IV—Defense agencies....	
	28,400,000

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11575

Title V—Military family housing and homeowners assistance ----- \$1,244,603,000

Total, titles I, II, III, IV and V ----- 2,826,611,000

Title VII—Reserve components:
 Army National Guard ----- 53,800,000
 Army Reserve ----- 38,600,000
 Naval and Marine Corps Reserves ----- 19,867,000
 Air National Guard ----- 31,500,000
 Air Force Reserve ----- 14,000,000

Total ----- 157,767,000

Grand total granted by titles I, II, III, IV, V and VII ----- 2,984,378,000

¹ Excludes \$1,500,000 for land at NAS Pensacola, Florida.

² Excludes \$9,000,000 for Aerospace Corporation, Los Angeles, California.

TITLE I—ARMY

The House had approved new construction authorization in the amount of \$611,653,000 for the Department of the Army. The Senate approved new construction authorization for the Army in the amount of \$644,211,000. The Conferees agreed to a new total for Title I in the amount of \$611,879,000 which is \$32,332,000 below the Senate figure and \$226,000 above the House figure. Among the major items considered in Conference and acted on by the Conferees were the following:

Fort Carson, Colorado—Land acquisition
 \$7,292,000

The Army requested a land acquisition project to expand the maneuver area at Fort Carson. Army witnesses testified that this project was Phase I of a multi-phase plan for acquisition of 75,420 acres which the Army said was necessary to obviate the expenditure of over \$3 million per occurrence to transport a division to the nearest installation having sufficient land area to accommodate realistic training by a full division force. The House deleted the authorization request in view of local opposition to further expansion of Fort Carson and the testimony of the Army at the last request for land acquisition in 1965 to the effect that the 1965 acquisition would be all the land ever needed at Fort Carson.

The Senate included the requested amount after special hearings but as a compromise, insisted that the funds be used to acquire only the Phase III portion of the multi-phase Army plan.

In Conference, after a very lengthy discussion, the Conferees agreed that the authorization request would be deleted without prejudice and that the Committee Members and or Committee Staff would make an inspection trip to Fort Carson to determine the priority of the Army's request and the necessity for further expansion of Fort Carson. Conferees believe they would thereby be in a position to better judge the merits of this request in next year's program.

The Senate receded.

Fort Riley, Kansas—Support facilities
 \$2,793,000

The House version of the bill deleted these support facilities on the basis they could safely be deferred for at least a year. In the Conference the Senate Conferees pointed out that this project has a direct impact on the Army's program to provide adequate housing for bachelor enlisted personnel at Fort Riley. They argued that since a sufficient number of administrative facilities were not provided with the original barracks construction a number of barracks spaces had been diverted for administrative use thus resulting in an overcrowding in the barracks. This project

will alleviate the overcrowding condition in the barracks as the unit headquarters are moved out.

The House receded.

Fort Hood, Texas—Entrance roads
 \$2,540,000

This project was deleted by the House because information received by the Committee was to the effect that this project was not time phased with the four-lane superhighway being constructed. The Senate version of the bill included this project.

In Conference it was pointed out that this two division post has the most severe traffic congestion problems of any Army installation. Further, Senate Conferees stated that the Army had deferred this project in previous years until it was time phased with the superhighway which is now 75% complete. Therefore, to derive full benefit of the new state highway in alleviating traffic congestion the Senate was adamant in their position that this project be approved.

The House receded.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama—Depot headquarters and administrative building
 \$2,260,000

The Senate deleted this Army request for reasons of economy. The House bill included this project.

In Conference the House Conferees pointed out that the headquarters activities are now disbursed in several widely separated buildings. They further pointed out that the inclusion of this project in the bill would assist in increased productivity, reduction in personnel travel time, waiting time, transportation and overhead costs for an estimated annual savings of \$135,000. House Conferees also pointed out that by consolidating all the separate activities into this new facility it would negate approximately \$1,050,000 in future construction requirements.

The Senate receded.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona—Academic building, phase I
 \$6,951,000

The Senate version of the bill included the authorization request for the academic facility. The House version of the bill did not contain the request. In Conference, the House Conferees argued that the Defense Department witnesses had testified in 1970 that one of the reasons for moving the Intelligence Center from Fort Holabird, Maryland to Fort Huachuca was because the facilities already in being at Fort Huachuca could accommodate the move with only a minimum expenditure for military construction of approximately \$4 million total. Senate Conferees argued that since the school was already in being and the facilities were inadequate and steadily deteriorating the Conferees should approve this project. House Conferees, however, were adamant in their position and convinced the Senate Conferees that this project should be reevaluated. The Conferees agreed that Committee Members and or Committee Staff should visit this installation and make an evaluation of the total future needs for the intelligence center now at Fort Huachuca.

The Senate receded.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina—Electrical-mechanical upgrade
 \$3,173,000

The House deleted this project in its consideration of the bill because it was felt that this amount of money should not be requested for a hospital that had not been completed until 1972. The Senate included this project in their bill.

In Conference the Senate Conferees argued that although the hospital was relatively new, the original design did not include fire safety code criteria current at the time. They further argued that this amount was necessary to correct the fire safety deficiencies and from a health and safety standpoint was urgent.

The House reluctantly receded.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska—Barracks modernization
 \$9,961,000

The House had included this project primarily to improve the unsatisfactory living conditions of the existing facilities and thereby generally enhance the attractiveness of military service to the individual. The Senate version had deleted this project.

The Senate conferees pointed out that for reasons of economy and its relatively low priority to the Army, this project could be deferred. In addition, the future manning levels at Fort Wainwright were sufficiently uncertain to justify a delay in this project.

The House receded.

NATO infrastructure—\$4 million

The Department of the Army had requested a total of \$88 million for the U.S. share of the NATO Infrastructure for the coming fiscal year. The House version approved the requested amount; however, the Senate version contained a general reduction in the amount of \$4 million.

In Conference, Senate Conferees pointed out that this general reduction was possible because of certain carry over authorization from prior fiscal years.

The House receded.

TITLE II—NAVY

The House approved \$547,373,000 in new construction authorization for the Department of the Navy. The Senate approved \$557,054,000. The Conferees agreed to a new total in the amount of \$552,456,000. This amount is \$4,598,000 below the Senate figure and \$5,083,000 above the House figure.

Among the major items originally deleted by either the House or the Senate and restored in the Conference were the following:

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland—Luce Hall addition and modernization
 \$6,450,000

The House deleted this particular project believing that it was of a relatively low priority in this year's Navy program. The Senate approved the project.

In Conference, the Senate Conferees pointed out that Luce Hall was built in 1920 and that the mechanical and electrical systems are antiquated and worn out and must be replaced. Further, there is no fire protection system, open stairwells, wooden floors, and interior partitions. They further stated that the antiquated building is environmentally unsatisfactory for academic use.

The House receded.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida—Aircraft maintenance hangar
 \$5,359,000

The Senate deleted this project believing it can be safely deferred for at least a year. The House approved the project.

In Conference the House Conferees pointed out that Cecil Field is now the master jet base of the Jacksonville-Mayport complex. It is the home port of all Atlantic Fleet light attack squadrons (A-7) and 5 ASW squadrons. There are now two 33-year-old obsolete hangars temporarily serving the needs of many of these squadrons. The House Conferees further pointed out that if the Hangar is not provided the readiness and proficiency training of Fleet operational squadrons equipped with modern ASW weapons systems will be impaired.

The Senate receded.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida—Bachelor enlisted quarters
 \$4,140,000

This project was deferred by the House without prejudice to a future year's program. The Senate approved the project.

In Conference, the Senate Conferees pointed out that these enlisted quarters were originally required to provide adequate billeting in support of Nuclear Power Training. This training function, which is moving to Orlando from Bainbridge and Mare Island, will comprise approximately 80% of enlisted student billeting requirement at the base.

H 11576

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

After a thorough discussion of this project, the House receded.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California—Bachelor enlisted quarters, \$8,657,000

The House Committee deferred this project without prejudice believing that assets in the area of the Naval Training Center were adequate. The Senate approved the project.

In Conference the Senate Conferees pointed out that the space which is available was constructed between 1922 and 1943 as open bay barracks and have served long beyond their useful life. Many of the inadequate barracks are located directly under the flight path of the commercial airport and practically all are in high noise zone without any acoustic attenuation.

The House receded.

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island—Weapons development building, \$4,742,000

The Senate Committee added this project during their Committee review of the bill. The House Committee did not review this project.

In Conference, the Senate Conferees pointed out that this Center is the principal RDT&E Center for underwater combat systems. Current and planned weapons programs require the capability to develop and test under controlled conditions, models which can simulate, at low cost, the system or subsystem. They further pointed out that if this facility is not provided, the optimum development of new weapons and components will be precluded through a lack of a coordinated facility capable of full system assembly, integration and analysis.

The House receded.

Diego Garcia—Support facilities, \$14,802,000

The House Committee added the expansion of facilities project in the amount of \$29,000,000 for the Naval Communications Facility on Diego Garcia. The House Committee believes it is important in carrying out our national policy and in the interest of the United States for the U.S. Navy, from time to time, to have a greater presence in the Indian Ocean. The proposed support facilities will shorten the logistic tail for various task groups that periodically deploy to the Indian Ocean, and reduce the logistic support cost.

The Senate Committee authorized \$14,802,000 for the expansion of the present facilities. Since the Navy did not reclaim the Senate money reduction, the House Conferees did not object to the reduction.

Diego Garcia—Compromise Language Regarding Further Congressional Action

The Senate inserted language (Section 612; Section 613 of the Conference Report) which requires the President to certify in writing that the need for new expansion facilities had been evaluated by him and that such projects are essential to the national interest of the United States and this certification must be approved by a joint resolution of both Houses.

The House Conferees argued that the Senate language, in effect, would allow legislation by inaction and insisted that some language should be used that would permit either House of Congress to prohibit the obligation of funds for Diego Garcia by a resolution of disapproval of that House.

The House Conferees offered a compromise that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act for the construction at Diego Garcia could be obligated until certain specified conditions are met. These require that the President certify to the Congress in writing an evaluation by him of the need for, and the essentiality of, these facilities. Further, 60 days of continuous session of Congress must have expired following the certification with the fur-

ther condition that within that 60 day period either the House or the Senate may pass a resolution of disapproval for the project, thereby precluding obligation of any funds authorized pursuant to this Act for the project.

At the insistence of the Senate Conferees, additional language was added to the conference report which provides in substance that parliamentary tactics aimed at delaying a vote on the Senate floor regarding a resolution of disapproval will be precluded.

Under the circumstances the Senate reluctantly receded and agreed to the compromise language.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The House approved \$410,227,000 in new construction authorization for the Department of the Air Force. The Senate approved \$387,906,000.

The Conferees agreed to a new total in the amount of \$399,773,000 which is \$10,454,000 below the House figure and \$11,867,000 above the Senate figure.

Among the major items in Conference which were resolved after much deliberation are:

Kelly AFB, Texas—Logistical materials storage facility \$7,071,000

The Senate approved but the House denied this project. The House was informed that the facility could be safely deferred for at least a year. The Air Force, prior to the program being submitted to Congress, had scheduled this particular project in the FY-77 program but moved it up two years.

The Senate Conferees insisted that this project would reduce the Air Force budget for personnel by 28; fork lift trucks by 10; tugs by 2; trucks and trailers by 2; locomotives by one; and operations and maintenance expenditures on over 1,000 square feet of temporary WW-II storage buildings. Senate Conferees argued that tangible benefits would allow for proposed capital investment to amortize in 3 to 4 years.

The House receded.

McClellan AFB, California—Logistical materials processing facility, \$8,856,000

The House deleted this project in its original consideration of the bill because only 2 to 3 years ago some \$400,000 was expended for the rehabilitation of a warehouse for the installation of equipment to handle the workload then at McClellan. House Conferees felt that this building could be utilized for the materials processing for several more years.

Senate Conferees argued that this project would not be completed for at least one and a half to two years and that upon completion the direct savings that would be obtained from this construction would amortize the capital investment in 2½ years. They further argue that the present high bay facility which is badly needed for storage purposes is not functionally configured for efficient receipt and issue processing. Mechanized material handling systems cannot be properly arranged causing excessive rehandling of material with resultant delays, increased costs, and damage.

After a thorough discussion, the House reluctantly receded.

Williams AFB, Arizona—Flight simulator training facility, \$5,313,000

The House Committee deleted this project without prejudice believing that the simulator equipment would not be delivered until after the completion of the facility. House Conferees argued that the construction effort could safely be deferred at least one year without jeopardizing the simulator program which House Conferees agree is essential. Senate Conferees argue that the simulator equipment would be delivered on approximately the completion date of the facility. They further insisted that the present simulator technology permits the duplication of

all the airborne pilot experiences and that a reduction of 40 hours of flying time per student would be realized through the use of the simulator. Air Force figures indicate that this change equals to a total reduction of approximately 50,000 flying hours in FY-78 and an annual reduction of almost 150,000 hours when the entire program is implemented at all eight graduate training bases in FY-1983.

Senate Conferees were adamant that the simulator program go forward immediately with no delay, therefore the House reluctantly receded.

Andrews AFB, Maryland—Special aircraft support facility, \$8,770,000

The House deleted this project in view of the fact that the FY-74 program as passed by the Congress authorized \$13.5 million for these airborne support command facilities at Andrews AFB and this authorization was not funded. The Senate bill contained the \$8,770,000.

Senate Conferees argued that the inflationary spiral would make it impossible to proceed with the necessary support facilities at Andrews without the authorization requested by the Air Force. Senate Conferees further argued that by awarding one contract for these facilities instead of separate contracts, the original facilities envisioned could be completed within the money authorized even with today's inflation. They insisted that denial of the FY-75 request would eliminate the proposed maintenance and logistics support facilities. Further, the Air Force's ability to support the airborne command post would be severely impaired and the aircraft down time would increase considerably.

After much discussion the House receded.

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee—HIRT facility, \$44,000,000

The House Committee included \$44 million for the HIRT Facility at the AEDC. However, prior to the final Senate action the Air Force revised their estimate from \$44 million to \$94 million. This revised estimate is a result of rapidly escalating construction costs, coupled with extensive increases in lead time for delivery of materials and equipment such as structural steel, electric motors and electric compressors.

Although the need for this facility is still valid, according to the Air Force, it was deemed advisable to delete this project at this time for reexamination of its cost effectiveness.

The House receded.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

The Senate bill provided \$4 million for the first phase of the radiological clean up of Eniwetok Atoll; the House had deleted the funds. House Conferees insisted that testimony before them failed to reveal any definitive plans or cost estimates. The testimony was to the effect that the \$4 million would establish a base camp and allow a "meager beginning of the cleanup effort." The House Conferees maintained that it would be premature to fund the clean up project until the Defense Department had a coherent and comprehensive rehabilitation plan. However, all conferees wish to emphasize that the U.S. Government should fulfill its commitments to the people of Micronesia, and the Defense Department in particular must devise a positive program for cleaning up the Atoll as soon as possible.

The Senate receded without prejudice.

TITLE V—FAMILY HOUSING

The Department of Defense presented an authorization request for appropriations for military family housing and a homeowners assistance program for totalling \$1,347,283,000. This was for 10,462 units of new construction, improvements to existing housing, operations and maintenance, debt payments, etc. Also included in the family housing request was an increase in the statutory aver-

December 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11577

age unit cost limitation on the construction of military family housing from \$27,500 to \$30,000 average cost for the United States and from \$37,000 average unit cost outside the United States and Alaska and Hawaii to \$40,000. The Department's new construction request reflected cost increases due primarily to continued cost escalation.

The House authorized 5,552 units which is 4,910 below the Department request and the Senate authorized construction of 7,120 units a reduction of 3,342 below the Department's request. The House approved increases in average unit cost limitation from \$27,500 to \$30,000 for the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii); and from \$37,000 to \$40,000 average cost in other areas. The Senate approved average unit cost increases from \$27,500 to \$29,500 for the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii); and from \$37,000 to \$40,000 average cost in other areas. Both the House and the Senate approved \$5 million for homeowners assistance.

Of special significance was the Department's request this year for 3,000 units of housing for junior enlisted personnel not heretofore considered eligible for housing. The House denied all 3,000 units but the Senate approved 1,458.

In Conference the Conferees agreed to authorize 6,800 family housing units at an average cost of \$30,000 per unit as originally requested by the Department for inside the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) and at \$40,000 for Alaska, Hawaii and overseas locations. Further, after a thorough discussion the Conferees agreed that it was not necessary for the government to invest in constructing housing units for personnel who may have enlisted for a minimum period of time on a trial basis or for those personnel who may not have seriously considered a career in the military service.

The Conferees agreed to a new total for the family housing program in the amount of \$1,244,603,000. The amount approved includes \$5 million for homeowners assistance and is \$3,819,000 below the Senate figure and \$58,722,000 above the House figure.

The Defense Department proposed an increase in the unit cost of leased housing for the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico and Guam an increase from an average of \$210 per month to \$235 per month and from \$290 per month to \$310 per month maximum for any one unit. Further, they requested an increase for Hawaii from \$255 per month to \$335 per month average and from \$300 per month to \$430 per month maximum for any one unit. The House approved the requested increases in the statutory average costs and maximum cost limitation for domestic leases except that in the case of Alaska and Hawaii the average cost would be increased to only \$295 and the maximum to \$365. The Senate approved the requested increases for the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) but limited Alaska and Hawaii to an average cost of \$315 per month and the maximum of \$375.

In Conference the House argued that the increases requested for Alaska and Hawaii were too extreme and that a lesser increase would satisfy the needs of the Department of Defense.

After a thorough discussion the Senate receded.

Section 507(b) places limitations on overseas leasing and had heretofore exempted 300 units of representational quarters from the \$625 maximum limitation. The House went along with this exemption as requested, but the Senate reduced the number of units exempted by 150. Senate Conferees argued that they had evidence of many abuses in this program with exorbitant rents being paid unnecessarily. Senate Conferees were very persuasive and the House receded.

Section 509 is a new Section added on the Senate Floor by an amendment proposed by

Senator Roth which would prohibit the use of any money authorized to be appropriated by this or any other act for the purpose of installing air conditioning equipment in any new or existing military family housing unit in the state of Hawaii.

The House receded.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 603 grants authority to the secretary concerned to increase line item authorization by 5% inside the United States, other than Alaska and Hawaii, and by 10% in the latter states when he deems it necessary to meet unusual cost variations. The Department request for FY 1975 asked for an additional 10% to be added for the purpose of (1) including design and construction modifications estimated to yield significant reductions in energy consumption, and (2) to meet unusual variations in cost arising out of the current energy crisis.

This provision was denied by the House in its entirety. The Senate approved the 10% variation only as it relates to meeting unusual cost variations directly related to the energy crisis.

After a thorough discussion the House receded.

In Section 607 the Defense Department requested that the floor figure of \$150,000 be raised to \$300,000 for architect/engineer projects wherein contracts in excess of that amount must be reported to the Congressional committees with a waiting period of 30 days prior to execution of the contract. The House approved a revision upward to \$225,000. The Senate approved the requested \$300,000 figure.

The Senate receded.

Section 610 of the House bill (Section 608 of Conference bill) compares to Section 608 of the Senate bill and authorizes the Secretary of Defense to take certain actions to lessen any adverse community impact resulting from the TRIDENT installation at Bangor, Washington.

The Senate version is identical to that previously approved by the Congress for the SAFEGUARD sites in Montana and North Dakota. The Senate Conferees pointed out that their version was preferable to the House version because the Senate version required specific authorization in each annual Military Construction Authorization Act and it required a semi-annual report to the Armed Services Committees as to the use of the funds.

After a thorough discussion the House receded.

Section 609 of the Senate bill (Section 609 of Conference bill), amends recently passed P.L. 93-346, which provides for a temporary official residence for the Vice President. The bill as it passed the Congress contained several deficiencies and the purpose of this provision is to clarify the original legislation. In effect it is a rewrite of P.L. 93-346. This provision was not in the House bill.

Particular attention was called to section 5 of this provision which precludes the expenditure of funds for the maintenance, care, repair, furnishing or security of any residence for the Vice President other than the temporary official residence provided for in Public Law 93-346. It is not the intent of the Congress to preclude the provision for temporary security measures necessary for the protection of the Vice President and his family for short periods of time at residences other than the temporary official residence of the Vice President, such as through the use of security Trip packages.

The House receded.

Section 611 of the House bill (Section 611 of Conference bill) amends Section 2662 of Title 10 USC to prohibit the termination of an existing license or permit held by a military department for real property owned by the U.S. Government if the military department has made or proposed to make substantial investments in connection with its

use of the property. This amendment would avoid the capricious cancellation or modification of licenses or permits of public lands to the military when large amounts of public monies had already been expended or were programed in support of essential military activities on such lands unless the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives were notified 30 days prior to such action. The Senate bill contained no such provision.

The Senate recedes.

Section 610 of the Senate bill (Section 611 of Conference bill) was added by the Senate. It is designed to amend existing law to permit the adjustment of and the use of the surcharges on commissary sales for the construction, acquisition and improvements to commissary stores, which are now paid for out of appropriated funds.

The surcharge is currently 3% for the Army and Air Force within the U.S. and 3% to 5% for the Navy and Marines worldwide. Commissary prices were alleged to be on an average 20% to 25% (this is believed to be low—the Army testified to 30%) below the private sector, and commissary patrons do not pay local sales taxes, which makes the overall savings quite substantial.

In the Army alone an increase of .5 of 1% in the surcharge would provide one new commissary per year.

After a thorough discussion of this provision, the House receded.

In section 608 of the House passed bill (Section 612 of Conference bill), authority was added for the use of proceeds from the sale of recyclable materials at military installations. First, the cost of collection, handling and sale, including purchases of equipment necessary for the recycling, could be financed from these proceeds, and then the remaining funds, up to a maximum of \$50,000 per year at any one installation, could be used for environmental improvements and energy conservation projects. The balance, if any after such expenditures, would be returned to the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There was no such provision in the Senate bill.

After a thorough explanation by the sponsors from the House Committee the Senate receded.

Section 612 of the Senate bill (Section 613 of the Conference bill), the compromise language regarding the support facilities on Diego Garcia, is discussed under the Navy Section of the Joint Statement of Managers.

Section 613 of the Senate bill (Section 614 of Conference bill) was added to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Ozark Public Building Authority, an agency of the City of Ozark, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) for use as a permanent site for the U.S. Army Aviation Museum.

An identical bill has been approved by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Armed Services Committee, therefore the House receded.

Section 609 of the House bill (Section 615 of Conference bill) was a provision added to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy to the Boy Scouts of America of approximately 12.46 acres of the Navy Education and Training Program Development Center at Elliyson, Florida. This conveyance would be at fair market value and would require the Boy Scouts of America to pay for the necessary surveys and pay for the necessary legal documents. The Navy posed no objection to this transfer and House Conferees pointed out that the property would substantially benefit the training and camping programs in the Gulf Coast Council.

The Senate receded.

Section 612 of the House bill (Section 616 of Conference bill) would authorize the con-

H 11578

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 10, 1974

veyance by the Secretary of the Army to the State of Louisiana of approximately 1,710 acres of U.S. land in Saint Tammany Parish now known as Camp Villere. This property has for many years been under license to the State for Louisiana National Guard use and will continue to be used for these purposes under the proposed conveyance. This conveyance would facilitate planned improvements to this property for National Guard purposes by the State and would reserve to the United States the right to reoccupy and use the property in time of war or emergency. This provision is similar to a number of other like conveyances in past years where the U.S. Government has passed title to such National Guard camps to the States in order to facilitate militarily essential improvements by the States which in a great number of instances are prohibited by State law unless title to the property is vested in the State. This was added by the House and is not in the Senate bill.

The Senate recedes.

Section 606 places statutory cost limitations on square foot costs of permanent barracks and bachelor enlisted quarters. The Department proposed an increase to the square foot cost of barracks from \$28.50 to \$31.00 and officer quarters from \$30.50 to \$33.00. The House denied the requested increase but the Senate approved the increase which is approximately 8% and is consistent with building cost increases.

The House receded.

Section 614 of the Senate bill was added by a floor amendment which inserted the provision that any funds authorized in this and future acts may be used to provide appropriate facilities in the event women are admitted into the various service academies.

House Conferees pointed out that the annual Military Construction Authorization request is submitted to the Congress by line item. The amendment would have given blanket authorization to use funds specifically authorized and funded for other purposes to be applied to construction of other facilities not approved by the Administration nor authorized in a Military Construction Act.

After a thorough discussion the Senate receded.

Section 611 of the Senate Bill was added by the Senate and would amend Chapter 37 U.S.C. in regard to the change in status of members of the Uniformed Services who are in a missing in action status. No change could be made unless: (1) the President of the United States had determined and notified the Congress in writing that all reasonable actions have been taken into account for such members and that all reasonable effort has been made to enforce the provisions of article 8(b) of the Paris Peace Accord of January 27, 1973; and (2) the Secretary concerned notified the next-of-kin of such person in writing of the proposed change in status, and the next-of-kin of such person has not filed with the Secretary concerned, within sixty days after receipt of notification of the proposed change in status, an objection to such proposed change.

This section was discussed at length and in view of the fact that the House Committee has announced hearings on this matter in a separate bill previously introduced, the Senate reluctantly receded.

TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

The House bill contained a total of \$152,267,000 to support the facilities programs of the Guard and Reserve Components of the military departments. The Naval and Marine Corps total of \$19,867,000 reflects an added \$1,335,000 which the House Committee approved to facilitate the Naval Reserve expansion of an existing excess Air Force facility concurrent with a similar action by the Army Reserve. The Senate version of the bill contained no such addition.

After explaining the need for this facility and the necessity of concurrent construction the Senate receded.

The Senate version of Title VII contained an added \$7 million to the amount requested for the Air National Guard. The House version contained no such addition. Senate Conferees argued that aircraft conversions within the Air Guard since the bill was submitted to the Congress generated additional construction requirements which actually total around \$11 million. These conversions particularly relate to the F-106, A7, F4 and C-130E aircraft.

After a thorough discussion of new requirements because of aircraft conversions, the Conferees agreed to add \$5.5 million to the requested \$26 million giving the Air Guard a total of \$31.5 million.

The House receded with an amendment.

F. EDW. HEBERT,
OTIS G. PIRE,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
SAMUEL STRATTON,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
CARLETON J. KING,
G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
SAM J. ERVIN,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
JOHN G. TOWER,
STROM THURMOND,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from December 9 until December 21, on account of illness.

Mr. DELLUMS (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 1:30 p.m. for the remainder of today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS to address the House, today, for 60 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, for 60 minutes, on Monday, December 16, 1974, Mr. LEGGETT, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DE LUIGO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 30 minutes, on December 17, 1974.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$695.

Mr. STARK and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Congressional Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$695.

Mr. LEGGETT and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,737.50.

Mr. STRATTON to include at the end of his remarks in connection with Hébert amendment on Surface Transportation Act, two letters:

(a) from Deputy Secretary of Defense William Clements to OMB.

(b) from Deputy Comptroller General of the United States to Mr. STAGGERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISH.

Mr. McCLOSKEY in three instances.

Mr. GUYER.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. KETCHUM.

Mr. MICHEL in four instances.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. BURGNER.

Mr. PARRIS in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. CRONIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in eight instances.

Mr. TEAGUE.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. LITTON.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. DENHOLM.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S 20740

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 5, 1974

not expecting any agreement at this time that would cause any appreciable reduction in expenditures.

There is, though, a sound hope that the agreement, if carried out as announced, will result in preventing an increase. We have to do that first, and then take the next step, if possible.

Because this agreement is an arms limitation rather than an arms reduction, we can expect no actual reduction in defense expenditures now because of this agreement. It might work out a little better than that, but this is not a disarmament. I would not favor a disarmament in world affairs as conditions are now. It would be a dangerous thing. We could not afford to take such a chance.

This has been, all the time, an arms reduction effort, and an arms limitation effort. This agreement is not a reduction, necessarily, but a limitation, to define some limits. That is what this agreement has done.

I am a fact man. I like to know the facts. We could develop some surprise facts. I would like to count those for others. I have learned most of what I know here in the Senate, and I have learned from other Senators. But man is born with some common sense, and has teachings from his parents or someone in their place, before he ever goes to the Senate. I think that common sense and logic, and the down-to-earth qualities about this agreement, are what sell it. You do not have to be a scientist or a technician to measure this one.

This is the approach that I have been looking for that we could take because it has something to stand on.

The American people should also remember that our present arsenal of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, capable of placing nuclear weapons on target, are the most advanced in the world, and are now capable of destroying any given number of targets that we may choose.

We do not want to choose to destroy any, but if driven to it we have the capability.

This capability is not confined either to any one particular kind of weapon or delivery system, but is based on a wise mixture of what we call the TRIAD of land-based and sea-based missiles and heavy bombers.

Under the present plans, we, of course, expect to keep it that way—the TRIAD of land-based and sea-based missiles, as well as the heavy bombers.

For well over two decades the United States strategic policy has been one of nuclear deterrence, which means the capability to mount an effective nuclear counterattack against Russia or any country in the event the United States should be attacked first. This agreement will not affect this capability.

Also, we shall be free to continue to develop our research and technology in this field of weapons.

This agreement, as now outlined, has been discussed with the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. He assures me that he and the Chiefs of Staff of all the services approve the agreement as outlined.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield.
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my request not interrupt the continuity of the Senator's statement.

I ask unanimous consent that during the rest of the day Senators may speak out of order for not to exceed 30 minutes, and the limitation on time not apply to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) who has already begun his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the leader very much, advising me, too, in such a smooth way that maybe I am out of order. I did not mean to be. I received permission from such of the leadership as could be here at that time, and also the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, by virtue of the order, has officially recognized that the Senator is not out of order.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It was not my intent to object.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to back our assistant floor leader as much as I can in his efforts over the years—bringing some order out of chaos here. He has given long and patient effort, and has greatly improved conditions on the floor.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I am sorry for the interruption.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CASCADE HEAD SCENIC-RESEARCH AREA, OREG.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 8352.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CLARK) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8352) to establish the Cascade Head Scenic-Research Area in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, as follows:

Page 3, line 24 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out all after "activities," over to and including "occurrences," on page 4, line 3, and insert: "Timber harvesting activity may occur in these subareas only when the Secretary determines that such harvesting is to be conducted in connection with research activities or that the preservation of the timber resource is imminently threatened by fire, old age, infestation, or similar natural occurrences."

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, H.R. 8352 is a bill which was passed by the House of Representatives earlier in this session and was passed by the Senate on August 16, 1974, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The House has concurred in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is technical in nature and does alter the substance of the Senate version.

My colleagues are aware of the need for this protection, and Senator PACKWOOD and Congressman WENDALL WYATT have played key roles in securing passage of this important legislation.

The amendment of the House is acceptable to Senator PACKWOOD and myself as well as to the other Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to H.R. 8352.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I simply want to echo the sentiments of the senior Senator from Oregon, to thank him for the work he has done on this matter, and to thank Representative WENDELL WYATT, who is retiring this year, in whose district this area exists.

This is one of the last unspoiled estuary areas on the Pacific coast, and under the provisions of this bill, that section will be set aside as a scenic research area. It was principally U.S. Forest Service land, but this bill will guarantee its protection forever.

I thank my colleague for getting this measure through the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I am delighted to share in the passage of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD).

The motion was agreed to.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIEGO GARCIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I feel compelled to speak out on the issue of Diego Garcia, the projected naval operating facility in the Indian Ocean. As we move toward the final days of this second session of the 93d Congress, Senators are receiving a great deal of pressure from both the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy to approve \$14,802,000 as a downpayment on naval facilities that will enable the Navy to operate carrier task forces from the island of Diego Garcia. In addition, the Air Force is requesting Air Force facilities on Diego Garcia that will enable KC-135 tankers to refuel B-52's operating out of Thailand over the Indian Ocean. First of all, I would like to briefly give

December 5, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20739

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

SUPPORT OF THE VLADIVOSTOK AGREEMENT ON STRATEGIC WEAPONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for but a few minutes. I do think I ought to say something with reference to the informal agreement that has been had with Soviet Russia by President Ford regarding nuclear weapons. There is a great deal being said about it, and all the detail facts are not in, and the formalization of this proposed treaty has not been had, but I base my remarks on the assumption that the matter, as announced by President Ford, the agreement, preliminary in nature, will develop formally along the same substantial lines that he has outlined.

Mr. President, in the coming weeks and months this agreement between President Ford and the Soviet Union will be the subject of extensive discussions, even though a congressional decision will not be required until the comprehensive agreement is submitted to Congress, hopefully in 1975, for ratification.

Mr. President, I fully support this preliminary agreement as announced, and I hope that President Ford will receive growing public support in this historic effort to limit the strategic arms.

Naturally, I would have preferred lower ceilings on the strategic weapons for both countries, and I continue to hope that the vast arsenal of strategic weapons in both the United States and Soviet Russia can be mutually reduced in the future on an equality basis.

This agreement, in establishing an overall ceiling on two vital elements in our strategic arsenal, will be a framework within which more extensive arms limitations can be achieved.

This announcement, therefore, is a critical step.

Mr. President, I felt for a long time, until some boundary lines could be established, or we may call it a ceiling or a top, until those would be established we would not be making substantial headway.

Of course, this agreement had to be preceded by a more preliminary one.

WHAT DOES THE AGREEMENT CONTROL—TWO ELEMENTS

This agreement places a limitation or ceiling on two elements of the strategic systems of the United States and the Soviet Union. The first is the limitation of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles which include land-based and sea-based intercontinental ballistic missiles and strategic bombers.

Expressed in a more down-to-earth way, they include our land-based ICBMs and our sea-roving missiles like the Poseidon, as carried by the Poseidon submarine, and strategic bombers.

The second element is the limitation of 1,320 on strategic missiles which may be

armed with multiple independently targeted warheads, that is, MIRVed missiles.

Spelling that out just a little more, it just means that 1,320 of these missiles, from whatever source propelled, may have independently targeted smaller bombs or weapons on them—targeted toward many places all in the same firing. Several different cities, say within a reasonable range could be targeted from the same rocket.

NEW PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY IN NUMBERS

Mr. President, as we well know, the interim agreement of SALT provided for greater Russian numbers of certain strategic weapons in compensation for the U.S. qualitative advantage in these systems.

For the first time, this agreement establishes identical numerical ceilings for both sides with respect to strategic delivery vehicles and the number of MIRV missiles. This equality in numbers is an improvement from the interim agreement and is a sound basis on which to build further limitations in the future.

OTHER FAVORABLE ASPECTS OF AGREEMENT

In addition, the agreement has the advantage of being simple in covering those systems which are the heart of the strategic arms race. It overcomes a number of hurdles that have complicated negotiations up to now. Included in these hurdles have been arguments over whether recognition should be given to the side which has the greater technological advantage, possible geographical advantages which affect strategic systems, whether the capability of allies should be taken into account and whether the so-called forward-based nuclear systems should be taken into account. All these issues were set aside. This agreement, therefore, represents great progress from the standpoint of negotiations.

NO JEOPARDY TO U.S. SECURITY

The strategic security of the United States is based on the TRIAD, consisting of our heavy bombers, land-based missiles, and nuclear submarines. The TRIAD will remain intact and undiminished by this agreement. The United States will not have to reduce its strategic force by one single bomber, or one missile—land-based or sea-based. Under the agreement, the United States will have the flexibility to improve the quality and alter the mixture of its strategic forces. Moreover, it will permit the completion of every new strategic weapon system the United States now plans to build. This is due to the fact that the United States long-range planning does not contemplate more than 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles.

Now, this delivery vehicle, as used here, refers to carrying vehicles that can deliver the weapon on target.

The Russians, on the other hand, have already reached the allowable level of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles and will therefore be compelled to reduce slightly their number in order to come within the terms of the agreement.

The issue can be raised as to why this agreement has any value if no signifi-

cant reduction is to result. The great virtue is that this is a numerical ceiling, the absence of which could compel both sides to engage in an accelerated arms race and exceed the overall ceiling of 2,400, at enormous national cost to both sides.

Someone has said that this will create an arms race. It will not create an arms race. We are already in an arms race, and we have been in it for a long time without any agreed ceiling, of boundary lines of any kind, and this agreement does take that necessary, highly important step forward.

Mr. President, without this agreement the additional cost to the U.S. defense budget could be as much as \$4 billion per year. I refer that to the additional cost. This result is due to the fact that the Russians both could, and probably would, build up their strategic systems in excess of the 2,400 ceiling which would necessitate an additional buildup by the United States to compensate for the added Russian numbers.

I would emphasize that President Ford has stated that as a result of this agreement no major increases in U.S. strategic spending, other than for inflation, will be necessary in the future.

Well, we cannot guarantee a dollar figure of anything like that, of course, but it is a commitment here that nothing except ordinary increases because of inflation and related matters, or really purely research, is contemplated.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Mr. President, this agreement is a start and of course does not cover all of the elements with which strategic warfare can be conducted. Recognizing that there are many details and negotiating problems to be resolved, the agreement is nonetheless an important start. I feel that both nations do want an agreement, and this being the case, I am optimistic that one can be reached.

Now, we could all be mistaken, of course, in that surmise or in that fact.

If these negotiations succeed, it is my hope and belief that there will be a good chance that further negotiations could be undertaken which would lead to a mutual reduction in all elements of strategic capability.

Another one of my chief concerns, Mr. President, is the growing and spreading capability of many foreign nations, large and small, for developing nuclear weapons capability. This growing proliferation poses a most serious threat to world civilization.

If we can somehow stabilize United States and Soviet strategic weaponry by concluding a comprehensive arms limitation agreement, it will hopefully be a basis for controlling and reducing this capability among other nations.

Along with many other citizens I had hoped, too, that the new agreement in itself would cause a reduction in defense expenditures.

I was disappointed that the first agreement did not carry this possibility of a reduction in the defense expenditures, but I am not surprised that this one does not. I understand the problem better and have been into it deeper. I really was

December 5, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 20741

you some background, both historical and legislative, which bear directly upon the Navy's efforts to make the island of Diego Garcia an operating base.

Diego Garcia is an atoll located within the Chagos Archipelago in the middle of the Indian Ocean approximately 1,000 miles due south of the tip of India. The heavily vegetated island consists of 6,700 acres with average elevations of 3 to 7 feet. It is horseshoe shaped with a 40-mile perimeter. The enclosed lagoon is 5½ miles wide by 13 miles long with average depths of 30 to 100 feet. The annual rainfall is approximately 100 inches. The U.S. Government became interested in Diego Garcia in the early sixties, particularly when the British Government announced that it was withdrawing its naval forces from Singapore and indications were made public that Her Majesty's Government intended to greatly reduce its Indian Ocean naval squadron. At about the same time, the Russian navy began operations in the Indian Ocean and making port calls to nations bordering on the Indian Ocean. It must be pointed out that for years the U.S. Navy has been traversing the Indian Ocean with carriers and other auxiliary combatants when the transfer of aircraft carriers was made to the Pacific Fleet.

Beginning in the early sixties, as aforementioned, with the announcement that the British were greatly reducing their naval activity in the Indian Ocean, the United States has in a more frequent manner stepped up its operations in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, which is a part of the Indian Ocean. At the present time, naval presence is maintained at Bahrain consisting of a supply ship and two destroyers. The Russians have not matched this naval strength. However, since 1968 the Russians have greatly increased their presence in the Indian Ocean, sometimes having as many as 30 combatant ships, which include a large number of minesweepers.

The United States some time in calendar year 1966 began negotiating with the British Government for a lease to establish a communications station and an operational base on Diego Garcia. This base was to be an austere logistic support activity which was mainly a refueling stop for naval units operating in the Indian Ocean. In 1965, the British formed the British Indian Ocean territory which comprises the Chagos Archipelago which, of course, includes Diego Garcia. The U.S. Navy stated that the selection of these islands was predicated on unquestioned United Kingdom sovereignty in the absence of a population. A bilateral agreement was signed in December 1966 between the British Government and the United States, which granted base rights for a period of 50 years to the U.S. Government to the Indian Ocean territory.

The Navy came to Congress in the fiscal year 1970 military construction program with a submission for the first construction increment of a proposed logistic facility on the island of Diego Garcia. The logistic facility was approved by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the House Appropriations Military Construction Subcommittee. When presented to the Senate, there

was strong opposition from within the Senate Appropriations Committee to the United States becoming committed to another naval operation base within the Indian Ocean. Senator Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee at that time, was very much opposed to the United States committing the Navy to sustained operations within the Indian Ocean and so stated in committee meetings on a number of occasions. The Military Construction Subcommittee also strenuously opposed the appropriation of money to construct the operating facility, and the military construction fiscal year 1970 conference committee debated this matter through a number of meetings lasting over a 2-week period.

Finally, an oral agreement was reached wherein the Navy was to be instructed to come back in fiscal year 1971 for a new appropriation which would support only a communications station, and all of the logistic support facilities were to be deleted from the fiscal year 1971 program. The rationale at that time for the communications station was that, in time, the United States would have to withdraw from the main continent of Africa the large communications facility that the U.S. Government had at Asmara, Ethiopia. Kagnew Station Communications Center, Asmara, Ethiopia, is now being phased out and the Navy will centralize its African communications facilities at Diego Garcia.

In support of the fiscal year 1971 appropriations for the communications facilities on Diego Garcia, the Navy stated the following:

The requirement to close the gap in reliable communication coverage which exists today in the central Indian Ocean/Bay of Bengal area was a major consideration in developing the initial concept for a support facility on Diego Garcia. Establishment of a communications support capability in this area is an immediate requirement and is a requirement which exists independent of the modest logistics support facility which was rejected by the Congress. The purely passive role and image of a communications facility should not raise the same concern of active commitment which had apparently been associated with the logistics support aspects of the original concept.

As previously mentioned, the Navy was instructed to come back in the 1971 military construction program with a communications package only and to all intents and purposes the logistic support facility was not to be a part of the package. In fact, it was specifically agreed that there would be no items which could in any way support a carrier task force.

In all of the communications and oral conversations that the subcommittee had with the Navy, it was indicated that the Navy would not use Diego Garcia as an operational base. Members of the subcommittee were reassured, when the fiscal year 1971 construction budget for Diego Garcia was approved, that the Navy did not intend to operate fleet surface units from Diego Garcia.

To bring Senators up to date concerning the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill, H.R. 16136, which is still in conference, I will explain section 612 in the bill. This section pre-

cluded the obligation of any funds until the President of the United States has advised the Congress in writing that he has evaluated all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for these facilities and has certified that this construction is essential to the national interest. Such certification must be submitted to Congress and approved by both Houses of Congress. This will assure the opportunity for full debate on the policy question of Diego Garcia.

I might say, parenthetically, that I consider this most prudent and realistic action for Congress to take. I wish to point out further that section 612 of the authorization bill was adopted by a record vote of 83 to 0 in the Senate.

The position of the House Armed Services Committee is that the administration should be given the authority to build the facilities in Diego Garcia but that, prior to the exercise of that authority, the President shall notify Congress of his intention and that Congress shall have 60 days to reject the blanket authority it had previously given to him. This procedure has heretofore been used too often by the Executive and acquiesced in by Congress. The negative power of Congress—the power to deny a change in the status quo—is turned on Congress itself. The burden of persuasion shifts away from those who desire action to prove the rightness of their cause. Congress must insist that the justification for a policy must be made prior to the grant of authority. It is exactly that insistence that was included in the military construction authorization.

It is my contention, as stated earlier, that the Senate position in the authorization bill is realistic and prudent and Diego Garcia, as a policy question, should first of all be thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Foreign Relations, then the question should be taken to the floor and the two Houses of Congress should be allowed to work their will.

On November 17, at a meeting in New Delhi of the 30 nations surrounding the Indian Ocean, a policy statement was issued unanimously that America and the Soviet Union should not escalate the arms race in the Indian Ocean and the area should be left in peace; particularly, all 30 nations opposed the United States building a facility on Diego Garcia. The cost of this naval base for both construction and equipment will amount to approximately \$173 million; thus, as you can see, this \$14 million plus \$3.3 million is only a downpayment.

Within the Department of Defense we do have a difference of opinion as to how important the building of this base is to our national interest. The Navy says that it is imperative for the defense of the United States, particularly in keeping the oil routes open in the Indian Ocean. The CIA has stated that the buildup of the Russians, particularly in Somaliland, is certainly not as extensive as outlined by admirals testifying for this project.

Mr. President, is this Southeast Asia and Vietnam all over again? It appears to me that our Government must have learned something about trying to be policemen for the World during our ex-

S 20742

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 5, 1974

perience in Vietnam: 55,000 dead and 303,000 wounded men must certainly mean something to us. I respectfully submit that the United States cannot go on attempting to be a policeman for the world. And most certainly in my opinion, the construction of this operating base in the Indian Ocean is only a further effort by the Department of Defense to play the role of policeman in the Indian Ocean and to actively involve our military forces in the politics of an area that now wants to be left at peace.

Yet in the face of all the nations in the littoral area requesting that we not build up Diego Garcia as a naval base, there are those individuals in high places that contend we should go ahead in our own national interest with the building of this naval base. I ask the question—what really are our vital interests in the Indian Ocean besides gunboat diplomacy and “showing the flag”? Our presence in the Indian Ocean had no effect on the oil situation during the Yom Kippur war in October 1973; in fact, our naval vessels were completely cut off from Arab oil and the United States could do nothing about the Arab action.

In closing, there are a few points that I wish to make that I think have a direct bearing in my opinion upon whether or not Diego Garcia funding should be approved to build a naval base on Diego Garcia. In allowing this naval base to be built, I think Senators should be aware that they are actually voting for a three-ocean Navy. It is my contention that this base on Diego Garcia could cost hundreds of millions of dollars. We already have an admission from the Navy of a cost of \$173 million. Oh yes, the Navy will contend that the base will only cost \$35 million but they are not telling the American people of the cost for salaries of the Seabees that are building the base, nor are they advising the Congress of the complete costs for the communications equipment and other machinery that will go into the making of this base.

I submit that all of the information I have in hand shows that the aircraft carrier is now obsolete with the technical advancement of the new cruise missiles and I might say, by way of explanation, that in the Mediterranean Sea, the Soviets always know exactly where our carriers are.

I state that for just this one time cannot the U.S. Government wait and really find out what the intentions of the Soviet Union are in regard to the Indian Ocean. All the reports I have indicate that the Soviet Union's naval activity is of a low order.

In summary, I would like to say that it appears to me that our Department of Defense is advocating a three-ocean Navy to station sailors 10,500 miles from home and putting obsolete carriers in the Indian Ocean, which are vulnerable and practically defenseless against new weaponry.

Are we building a naval base, a new Wake Island, that is completely, in time of crisis, indefensible?

Mr. President, in closing I am reminded of a very important incident that occurred on the floor of the Senate. Some years back when the defense appropriation bill was on the floor and the Senate was considering appropriating money for the Navy for naval landing craft—FDL's—the late great chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Richard Brevard Russell, said and I quote:

If we make it easy for the Navy to go places and to do things, we will find ourselves always going places and doing things.

I remind the Senate in approving the building of a naval base on Diego Garcia that we will be making it easy for the United States to go to the Indian Ocean and more than likely that we will do things.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 17505—ORDER FOR BILL TO BE HELD AT DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 17505, to rescind certain budget authority recommended in messages of the President, which has been passed in the House, I believe, and is now at the desk, be held at the desk pending further disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1974 (H.R. 10710)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, it will be necessary, during the remaining days of this session, for the Senate to operate on a multiple-track system.

The unfinished business until disposed of will be H.R. 10710, the trade reform bill.

Having discussed this request with the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished assistant minority leader, and also with the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that on each day until the trade bill is disposed of, with the exception of Monday, for which an or-

der has already been entered, that the trade bill become the order of business at no later than 1 o'clock p.m. unless, in the discretion of the assistant majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader or his designee, the assistant majority leader then acts to take the trade bill up earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. This will allow the Senate to transact other business up until 1 o'clock every day. The call for regular order cannot displace pending business prior to 1 o'clock. At 1 o'clock the trade bill would automatically come up.

Under the rules, it would be called up at any time after the morning hour by a call for the regular order. This would allow the assistant majority leader who, in the absence of the majority leader, will be working in an attempt to move the legislative process along, after consultation with the leadership on the other side, to set aside pending business before the hour of 1 o'clock, if necessary, on any day, and proceed immediately to the trade bill.

Do I have a correct understanding of what I have requested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY AUTHORIZATION BILL (S. 4033)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent request which I have not cleared with anyone.

There is an agreement on the Atomic Energy authorization bill I do not know what our situation will be on Monday next after the debate on Mr. Rockefeller's nomination has played out.

There is no question but that under the rules, once Senators have stopped discussing the Rockefeller nomination, if they do so prior to the expiration of 5 hours of debate on Monday, the trade bill would automatically be brought up by a call for the regular order. Or at least it could be brought up. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After we go into the legislative session, that is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. That is the reason why I said a call for the regular order. A call for the regular order in executive session would not bring up the trade bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that after the debate on the Rockefeller nomination on Monday next, if such debate does not consume 5 hours on Monday, it may be in order for the assistant leader to return to legislative session, and that it be in order at that time to call up either the Atomic Energy authorization bill or the trade bill, and that if the Atomic En-

September 12, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16577

year, the commercial apple crop is up 4 percent and the peach crop is down 31 percent from last year.

The forecast also says crop conditions could have been even worse if there had not been a surplus of moisture in most of the state at the end of June, when the drought began.

LOCKING UP A CROP REPORT

(By Jack Egan)

When the United States Department of Agriculture releases one of its crop reports, the reverberations can quickly be felt around the world.

This was true in the wake of last Monday's forecast that put the corn harvest below 5 billion bushels—far less than even pessimistic analysts had predicted—and which also significantly reduced expected harvests for other feed grains, wheat and soybeans.

In a year when U.S. grain stocks are at the lowest point in more than a quarter of a century, the message from the drought-reduced crop report was clear: higher food prices and more inflation both here and abroad.

Because Agriculture Department officials from Secretary Earl Buttz down as well as other administration economists had earlier held out hopes for bumper crops large enough to tame the rate of inflation, the disappointment was all the more acute.

The next day, the reaction was dramatic. Corn hit a record \$4 a bushel on some cash markets.

Commodity prices shot up in a phalanx on world futures exchanges. Though led by corn, the activity was not limited to domestic agricultural commodities but spread to metals, sugar, cocoa and coffee.

In Europe, grain prices had record daily advances.

The Dow Jones average of 30 industrial stocks dropped another 10.88 points after a 10.01-point decline on Monday. Stock market analysts said a major factor was the crop report and what it said about future inflation.

In the highest circles of this government, there was consideration of export controls on agricultural commodities, no matter how unpalatable the prospect. Large export sales of corn were rumored in Chicago grain markets.

And livestock feeders, poultry raisers and dairy farmers—already squeezed by soaring feed costs—predicted widespread liquidation in the short term with smaller supplies and much higher prices to follow if corn, the major feed ingredient, stayed at \$4 a bushel.

The effect of the crop report was immediate and obvious.

Because of the high stakes and potential impact of the news—good or bad—contained in one of the crop reports, the Agriculture Department has established careful procedures to protect the integrity of both the reporting process and the information contained in the final document.

Though the information gathering had begun laboriously some weeks in advance, the final assembly by the Crop Reporting Board took place in the bowels of the main Agriculture Department building in Washington in a final 12-hour sprint called the lock-up.

A uniformed guard stands outside. No one who enters after the 3 p.m. start of the lock-up may leave until it ends at 3 p.m. All telephones have been disconnected.

The reason for the strict security is twofold.

First the information contained in the report can be used for personal speculative gain if released prematurely.

There is a popular tale—though most say it is apocryphal—of a breach in lock-up security that involved use of venetian blinds. A predetermined signal was given, the story goes, by a lock-up participant who closed

the blinds at a window and tipped a waiting accomplice outside on whether a crucial crop estimate was high or low. The accomplice then invested in the market.

No one seems to be able to verify whether the incident actually occurred. But there are no windows in the basement lock-up quarters today to either peer into or signal from.

When the crop report is complete and the lock-up period is ended, the head of the reporting board goes into an adjacent room where waiting wire service reporters have already dialed their telephones.

The reporters move away from their phones and stand behind a white line in a procedure as old as the Crop Reporting Board, which was established in 1905. The head of the board places a copy of the report, face down, next to each reporter's phone.

At precisely 3 p.m., the signal is given and the newsmen rush across the line and start reading the report summary to their headquarters. This is quickly translated into a story and appears on wire service tickers around the world within minutes.

The reason for the haste is more competitive than because of the immediate value of the information, although interest is intense. The commodity markets, however, have all closed once the report is out and speculators and hedgers have overnight to absorb the information before trading resumes the next morning.

Another reason for the insulation of the Crop Reporting Board is to protect it from undue political pressures during preparation of the report.

The temptation is perhaps too irresistible to nudge a number one way or another and thus convince people that things are better than they really are. To eliminate this possibility, the reporting board is out of touch with the Agriculture Department's brass until the document has been assembled.

Approximately one half hour before the lock-up ends, the Agriculture Secretary or one of the assistant secretaries enters, receives a briefing on the report and certifies it with his signature. He also leaves only at 3 p.m.

The report released on Monday was for crop conditions as of Aug. 1. It contained the first hard production forecasts for corn, sorghum, and other feed grains, soybeans, and cotton that were based on actual growing conditions in the fields.

Earlier estimates had been educated guesses—some critically say wishful thinking—that were based on surveys of how many acres farmers intended to plant of a certain crop, multiplied by historic yields.

The 6.7-billion-bushel corn crop projected by the USDA in March before planting had even begun was precisely this kind of guess. An expected harvest of 69 million acres was multiplied by a 97-bushel-per-acre yield and the result was 6.7 billion bushels. The tool was mainly arithmetic.

Subsequently, the USDA revised the number downward as the situation unfolded precariously. First, spring rains delayed planting of many acres. When the season finally began, the nation's grain belt was subjected to the worst drought in at least 20 years.

But although the number was dropped first to 6.4 billion and then to a range of 5.95 billion to 6.25 billion bushels, the USDA was still estimating rather than forecasting on any hard evidence.

When the hard evidence came in, as revealed in the August crop report, the news of the drought's effect was brutal. Average yield for corn was 77.8 bushels per acre, down from last year's 91.4 bushels and nowhere near 97 bushels.

Four million acres of corn had been lost entirely in the July weather.

Walter Goeppinger, chairman of the National Corn Growers Association, estimated

last week that farmers had lost \$320 million because of the USDA's initial 6.7-billion-bushel harvest projection.

Testifying before a Senate agriculture subcommittee, Goeppinger said farmers sold 800 million bushels early because of the bearish price forecast and could have gained an extra 40 cents a bushel if they had a more accurate view of the situation.

Crop Reporting Board chairman Bruce Graham worried aloud last week that the public viewed all estimates from the USDA the same, and made no distinction between the early projections put out by the department and the August crop report forecast based on field evidence. The result, he felt, might be a strain on the board's credibility.

The Crop Reporting Board has two sources of information for its forecasts. There are many surveys of farmers asking the condition of their crops as compared to a normal year. The average response for these surveys is approximately 35 per cent.

In addition, department employees called enumerators are sent out into specific plots of farm land statistically chosen to take various measures of the crops.

These specific plots are staked out, for the enumerators must return to them during the growing season and refine their assessments of how the crops are doing. This is how the so-called objective yield is determined.

For example, for corn, initially, the number of ears on a stalk is counted. Later, the length of the ear over the husk is measured. Then, at a late stage, the enumerator will determine the length of the average kernel row.

Sample ears are then sent to a laboratory to check their shelling percentage, their average weight and their moisture content. All of these things have a bearing on the ultimate yield.

After the harvest, enumerators will return to the plots to find out how much of the crop has been lost on the ground. Pieces of corn ears, kernels and other fragments are counted and measured so that a number can be subtracted from the projected yield to account for this loss.

For the August crop report, enumerators actually entered the fields on July 22. The reports were then gathered in each of the state offices, along with the mail surveys.

These reports are sent on to the Agriculture Department in distinctive envelopes that receive special handling. When they arrive in Washington, they are placed in a special steel box secured by two different locks. One key is kept in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the other is kept by the head of the Crop Reporting Board.

The final assembly takes place in the lock-up with a six-member board for each crop. Three of the members work for the USDA in Washington, and the other three are from the state offices.

Each board member makes an independent estimate of the projected average yield for that particular crop in each state.

The chairman of that board then winnows the separate estimates which are said not to vary much from each other—and determines a final figure. This is the objective yield figure which is multiplied against the already determined acreage expected to be harvested for a supply number.

ORDER FOR THE PRINTING OF H.R. 16136, THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL, AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 16136

be printed as amended by the Senate and passed yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 18136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$26,170,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,742,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, \$34,993,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$46,376,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$4,286,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, \$10,270,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$27,074,000.
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, \$42,197,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$9,625,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, \$36,827,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, \$12,296,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$8,124,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$9,858,000.
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$1,108,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$19,078,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$2,264,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$9,911,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$11,986,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$17,344,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$3,107,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$3,660,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$7,304,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$3,906,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$16,265,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$3,360,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,497,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, \$1,030,000.
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$541,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$5,388,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, \$559,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$4,726,000.
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$616,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$2,820,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, \$1,160,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$10,322,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,731,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, \$2,599,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$815,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$717,000.
Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$3,256,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$3,574,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,859,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$7,507,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$2,023,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$8,862,000.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, \$486,000.
Various Locations, \$19,778,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratories, New Hampshire, \$2,515,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$251,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$4,002,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$1,512,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$15,324,000.
Tripler General Hospital, Hawaii, \$1,205,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,356,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$16,358,000.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

Various Locations, \$10,723,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$557,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$5,139,000.

PUERTO RICO

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, \$1,862,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE

National Missile Range, \$1,272,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$148,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, \$532,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$32,355,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, \$4,159,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$84,000,000: *Provided*, That within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been

notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE", in section 101 as follows:

iWith respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000", respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000".

With respect to "Fort Sill, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000".

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$444,767,000;" "\$117,311,000;" and "\$562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$447,768,000;" "\$118,420,000;" and "\$566,188,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,931,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Public Law 93-166, section 105(b), amending Public Law 92-145, section 702, clause (1) as amended, having inserted erroneous figures, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$261,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, \$7,232,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$255,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$4,153,000.

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$10,274,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$4,971,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$7,350,000.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$2,338,000.

September 12, 1974

S 16579

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$296,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval District Commandant, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,883,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,377,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$7,706,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$14,943,000.

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, \$15,000,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$290,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$252,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$2,034,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$896,000.

Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$633,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,471,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$5,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,990,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,047,000.

Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$15,801,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$5,602,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$1,595,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$1,534,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$446,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida, \$7,417,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$3,239,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$8,709,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$795,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$19,448,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,478,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,561,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$1,485,000.

Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$7,112,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$200,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$15,352,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,750,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,564,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,284,000.

Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,888,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,080,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$1,428,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$1,953,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,619,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$8,371,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,011,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$11,772,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$12,943,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$1,048,000.

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,238,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$13,493,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, \$8,657,000.

Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$4,234,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$2,147,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, \$1,638,000.

Naval Hospital, Lemoore, California, \$333,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$77,000.

Naval Communications Station, Stockton, California, \$1,102,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard Vallejo, California, \$2,301,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$7,697,000.

Trident Support Site, Bangor, Washington, \$103,803,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, \$393,000.

Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,603,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Commander in Chief Pacific, Oahu, Hawaii, \$2,700,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$795,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,505,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,356,000.

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa, Hawaii, \$971,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$2,803,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune North Carolina, \$13,864,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,260,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$499,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$3,203,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$1,463,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,271,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California, \$397,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,849,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$44,251,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$3,186,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$947,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$1,026,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, Canal Zone, \$800,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$1,866,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$4,193,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, \$311,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$571,000.

Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland, \$1,188,000.

INDIAN OCEAN

Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$14,802,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$728,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,305,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,782,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$907,000.

Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan, \$360,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$1,624,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$3,741,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,059,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$4,038,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,059,000" and "\$250,924,000", respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida," strike out "\$3,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000".

With respect to "Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada," strike out "\$6,003,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,203,000".

Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" with respect to "Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy," strike out "\$8,932,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,632,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,644,000", "\$41,217,000", and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$485,564,000", "\$44,917,000", and "\$530,481,000", respectively.

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 92-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out "\$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,802,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi," strike out "\$4,532,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,466,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,756,000".

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$521,235,000" and "\$580,068,000", respectively.

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$6,885,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$2,775,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri, \$805,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,894,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$11,568,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$15,873,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,977,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$792,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$9,839,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$16,271,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$4,240,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,100,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$1,647,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$13,512,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$232,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, \$642,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$832,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$169,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$7,297,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$298,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$7,885,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,143,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$790,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$836,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$8,631,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$6,798,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$776,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$5,849,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$2,500,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$310,000.

Various Locations, \$13,242,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$14,699,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,155,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$1,373,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$408,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$341,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairchild, California, \$8,800,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$11,878,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$641,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$675,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,009,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$2,109,000.

Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$1,774,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$323,000.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$7,050,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$835,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$3,740,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$3,038,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$238,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,595,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$115,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$882,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$6,692,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$1,715,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$4,794,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,565,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,056,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$5,141,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$265,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$306,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$6,495,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$730,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$3,948,000.

Various Locations, \$5,194,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$2,056,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$13,700,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$13,962,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations, \$138,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$5,985,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$280,000.

United Kingdom, \$884,000.

Various Locations, \$63,081,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$4,135,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$595,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$1,995,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$8,100,000.

Sec. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. Section 609 of Public Law 89-188, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: "or if no appropriated funds are involved, has first been reported by the Air Force to the Congress in the manner set forth in section 2662, title 10, United States Code."

Sec. 305. (a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

September 12, 1974

S 16581

(1) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado", strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida", strike out "\$1,020,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,284,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE" with respect to "Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri", strike out "\$3,963,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,130,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to "Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia", strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to "Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida", strike out "\$7,039,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi", strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000".

(7) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas", strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000".

(8) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas", strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,461,000".

(9) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma", strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000".

(10) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas", strike out "\$3,154,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,307,000".

(11) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to "Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma", strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000".

(12) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming", strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000".

(13) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas", strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000".

(14) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada", strike out "\$2,588,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,637,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$260,727,000" and "\$283,029,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center (St. Louis AFS), St. Louis, Missouri, \$2,573,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$670,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,862,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$394,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,399,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$527,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$572,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas, \$646,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$938,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,363,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Johnston Atoll, \$1,458,000.

Eniwetok Auxiliary Airfield, \$4,000,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family Housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand four hundred and sixty units, \$82,396,000.

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, four hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, one thousand units.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, sixty units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, five hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, one hundred units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, three thousand one hundred and fifty-eight units, \$108,778,960.

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, seven hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, five hundred and twenty-six units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, three hundred and thirty-two units.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand three hundred units, \$40,143,500.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, one hundred and fifty units.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, two hundred units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, one hundred units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, two hundred units.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, two hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, two hundred and fifty units.

(b) Mobile Home Facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, two hundred and forty spaces, \$960,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$888,000.

(c) Demolition of existing structures on proposed sites for family housing:

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, \$540,000.

SEC. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation (excluding demolition authorized in section 501(c)), and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$29,500 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,000,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,000,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 504. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units not subject to the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act. This authority shall

S 16582

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 12, 1974

include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Total costs shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(a) Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred units, at a total cost not to exceed \$9,600,000.

(b) Two family housing units in Warsaw, Poland, at a total cost not to exceed \$120,000. This authority shall be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

Sec. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$175,500.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, one hundred and forty units, \$2,352,800.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, one unit, \$24,000.

Sec. 507. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$315 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$375 per month for any one unit."

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676), is amended by striking out "\$325" and "seven thousand five hundred" in the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$355", and "twelve thousand", respectively; and in the second sentence by striking out "three hundred units", and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred fifty units".

Sec. 508. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing and homeowners assistance as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including demolition authorized, improvements to public quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$307,907,060.

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$935,515,000; and

(3) for homeowners assistance under section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

Sec. 509. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the purpose of installing air-conditioning equipment in any new or existing military family housing unit in the State of Hawaii.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or de-

velop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 to title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States \$514,187,000; outside the United States \$130,024,000; or a total of \$644,211,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$512,620,000; outside the United States, \$44,434,000; or a total of \$557,054,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$302,709,000; outside the United States, \$77,097,000; section 302, \$8,100,000; or a total of \$387,906,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$32,400,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing and homeowners assistance, \$1,248,422,060.

Sec. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum of the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been

placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

(e) In addition to other cost variation limitations contained in this section or in similar sections of prior year military construction authorization Acts, any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this and prior military construction authorization Acts may be varied upward by an additional 10 per centum when the Secretary of the military service concerned determines that such increase is required to meet unusual variations in cost directly attributable to difficulties arising out of the current energy crisis. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

Sec. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 605. As of October 1, 1975, all authorizations for military public works including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in title I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth

in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-186 (87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(a) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3) (A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(b) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(c) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(d) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(e) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(f) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Fort Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(g) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid State Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137), as amended.

(i) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140), as amended.

(j) Message Center Addition, Aircraft Fire and Crash Station, Aircraft Maintenance Hangar Shops, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Mess Hall, Bachelor Officers' Quarters, Exchange and Recreation Building, and Utilities construction in the amount of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$829,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000, respectively, for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141), as amended.

(k) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), as modified by section 605(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-186 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct six hundred family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(a) (2) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148), shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

Sec. 606. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction index is 1.0:

(1) \$31 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$33 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior military construction authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 607. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure "\$150,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000".

Sec. 608. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to assist communities located near the TRIDENT Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such communities, if the Secretary determines that there is an immediate and substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities in such communities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of the TRIDENT Weapon System and that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by such communities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to communities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such communities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section to any local community for any community service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any such community and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such community and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

(d) Any funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, for carrying out the TRIDENT Weapon System shall be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year

beginning after June 30, 1975, for carrying out the TRIDENT Weapon System may, to the extent specifically authorized in an annual Military Construction Authorization Act, be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provision of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs.

(e) The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives semiannual reports indicating the total amount expended in the case of each local community which was provided assistance under the authority of this section during the preceding six-month period, the specific projects for which assistance was provided during such period, and the total amount provided for each such project during such period.

Sec. 609. (a) Public Law 93-346 (88 Stat. 340), designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, is amended to read as follows: "That effective July 1, 1974, the Government-owned house together with furnishings, associated grounds (consisting of twelve acres, more or less), and related facilities which have heretofore been used as the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, shall, on and after such date be available for, and are hereby designated as, the temporary official residence of the Vice President of the United States.

"Sec. 2. The temporary official residence of the Vice President shall be adequately staffed and provided with such appropriate equipment, furnishings, dining facilities, services, and other provisions as may be required, under the supervision and direction of the Vice President, to enable him to perform and discharge appropriately the duties, functions, and obligations associated with his high office.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall, subject to the supervision and control of the Vice President, provide for the military staffing and the care and maintenance of the grounds of the temporary official residence of the Vice President and, subject to reimbursement therefore out of funds appropriated for such purposes, provide for the civilian staffing, care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of such residence.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the foregoing provisions of this joint resolution. During any interim period until and before any such funds are so appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate services in connection with the temporary official residence of the Vice President from funds available to the Department of the Navy, subject to reimbursement therefor from funds subsequently appropriated to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

"Sec. 5. After the date on which the Vice President moves into the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution no funds may be expended for the maintenance, care, repair, furnishing, or security of any residence for the Vice President other than the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution unless the expenditure of such funds is specifically authorized by law enacted after such date.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed, with the approval of the Vice President, to accept donations of money or property for the furnishing of or making improvements in or about the temporary official residence of the Vice President, all such donations to become the property of the United States and to be accounted for as such.

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 202 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(and (5) in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(5) the temporary

official residence of the Vice President and grounds in the District of Columbia; (6) the Vice President and members of his immediate family; and (7)".

"Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 3086 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'protect the members of the immediate family of the Vice President, unless such protection is declined,' immediately after 'Vice President-elect'; and

"(2) inserting 'pay expenses for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and accounted for solely on his certificate,' immediately after 'apprehension of criminals';

"Sec. 9. It is the sense of Congress that living accommodations, generally equivalent to those available to the highest ranking officer on active duty in each of the other military services, should be provided for the Chief of Naval Operations."

(b) Except as otherwise provided therein, the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective July 12, 1974.

Sec. 610. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section and a corresponding item in the analysis:

"§ 2685. Adjustment of or surcharge on selling prices in commissary stores to provide funds for construction and improvement of commissary store facilities

"(a) Notwithstanding any other law the Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense may, for the purposes of this section, provide for an adjustment of, or surcharge on, sales prices of goods and services sold in commissary store facilities.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense, may use the proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) to acquire, construct, convert, expand, install, or otherwise improve commissary store facilities at defense installations within the United States and for related environmental evaluation and construction costs including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design."

Sec. 611. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 555 or 556 of title 37, United States Code, on and after the date of enactment of this section no change in the status of any member of the uniformed services who is in a missing status may be made unless and until the following two provisions have been complied with:

(1) the President of the United States has determined, and notified the Congress in writing, that all reasonable actions have been taken to account for such members and that all reasonable effort has been made to enforce the provisions of article 8(b) of the Paris Peace Accord of January 27, 1973; and

(2) the Secretary concerned notifies the next-of-kin of such person in writing of the proposed change in status, and the next-of-kin of such person has not filed with the Secretary concerned, within sixty days after receipt of notification of the proposed change in status, an objection to such proposed change.

(b) As used in subsection (a) of this section, the terms "uniformed services," "missing status," and "Secretary concerned" shall have the same meaning ascribed to such terms in chapter 10 of title 37, United States Code.

Sec. 612. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act with respect to any construction project at Diego Garcia may be obligated unless and until—

(1) the President has (A) advised the Congress in writing that all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia have been evaluated by him; and (B) certified to the Congress in writing that the construction of any such project is essential to the national interest of the United States; and

(2) such certification as required by clause (1)(B) of this section is submitted to the Congress and approved by joint resolution of both Houses.

Sec. 613. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Ozark Public Building Authority, an agency of the city of Ozark, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) for use as a permanent site for the museum referred to in subsection (c), and subject to the conditions described therein.

(b) The land authorized to be conveyed to the Ozark Public Building Authority as provided in subsection (a) is described as follows: All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in sections 13 and 24, range 23 east, township 5 north, Saint Stephens Meridian, Dale County, Alabama, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which is 216.0 feet north 89 degrees 57 minutes west of the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 24, on the western right-of-way line of Alabama State Highway Numbered 249, and on the boundary of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Fort Rucker Military Reservation;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,395 feet;

thence north 64 degrees 53 minutes west 700 feet;

thence south 25 degrees 07 minutes west 2,800 feet;

thence south 64 degrees 53 minutes east 700 feet, more or less, to a point which is on the western right-of-way line of said highway and on the boundary of said United States tract;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,405 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 45.00 acres, more or less.

(c) The conveyance provided for by the subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property so conveyed shall be used as a permanent site for a museum to display suitable public exhibits of the United States Army aviation equipment and allied subjects and aviation-oriented exhibits of other United States Government departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and of foreign origin, and if such property is not used for such purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to such real property shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, and to such other conditions as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe to protect the interest of the United States.

Sec. 614. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available pursuant to this or any other Act for the construction or maintenance of facilities at the service academy of any military department may be expended by the Secretary of the military department concerned for the construction and maintenance of such facilities as may be necessary or appropriate to provide for the admission of females as cadets or midshipmen (midshipwomen), as appropriate, at such academy.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term

"service academy of any military department" means (1) the United States Military Academy in the case of the Army, (2) the United States Naval Academy in the case of the Navy, and (3) the United States Air Force Academy in the case of the Air Force.

Sec. 615. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for site acquisition or construction of the CONUS Over-The-Horizon radar system receiver antenna during the period after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to May 31, 1975.

Sec. 616. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975".

TITLE VII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$53,800,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$38,600,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$18,532,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$33,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$14,000,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4771 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. Chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the figure "\$50,000" in paragraph (1) of section 2433a, Limitation, and inserting the figure "\$100,000" in place thereof.

Sec. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1975".

S. 355—SUBSTITUTION OF CONFERE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent, and I understand this has been cleared on the other side of the aisle, that the name of Mr. STEVENS be substituted for Mr. COOK as a conferee on S. 355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROLL CALL VOTES TO OCCUR AFTER 3:30 P.M. ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1974

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that there be no roll call votes before the hour of 3:30 p.m. on Monday next.

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000700050003-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/09 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000700050003-1

HR 16136

September 11, 1974

Productivity: One long range effort has to be to improve productivity to partially offset wage increases that are needed and inevitable. Productivity is a difficult thing to get at through Government programs, but perhaps better funding and more vigorous effort by the Productivity Council would be a good place to begin.

In summary, Mr. President I see a need for several actions. We should work immediately to reduce Government spending. At the same time we must take actions to reduce hardship created by current economic conditions—unemployment or the housing industry. Finally we must more carefully take other steps to slow inflation without prolonging unnecessarily our present soft economy or plunging it to further depths.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN CONSULAR CONVENTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted with the series of constructive developments recently in our relations with Czechoslovakia. They should contribute to the establishment of the realistic kind of détente we are seeking in the relations between the closed societies of the East and the open societies of the West.

Presently the Foreign Relations Committee is considering the new Consular Convention with Czechoslovakia as a step that I hope will bring the convention into early effect.

In a separate statement, I have praised the recent exoneration by the Czech courts of Mr. John Hvasta, accused of espionage in the cold war period. I cited this encouraging indicator as a bright spot in the lowering clouds of suspicion that still envelop East-West relations.

If both our countries implement the new convention with the objectivity and sense of justice exhibited by the Czech action in the Hvasta case, we can look forward to continuing improvement in the relations between the United States and Czechoslovakia.

Good consular relations foster increased business and cultural contacts between the citizens of the countries concerned. They provide mutual protection and reasonable freedom of movement for the tourist, the student, the ethnic visitor, the businessman. The multiplication of these contacts becomes the warp and woof of the fabric of genuine détente. That is why the Consular Convention can prove a real breakthrough in creating improved relations with Czechoslovakia and offsetting the crippling effects that the very nature of a closed society impose upon its external relations.

Good results of the successful negotiation of the convention are already discernable.

The growing trade between the United States and Czechoslovakia has received a new impetus, so that the United States is presently the largest Western exporter to Czechoslovakia after West Germany.

In July of this year, preliminary agreement was reached between our two countries on property compensation for American citizens, an issue that had plagued our relations with Czechoslovakia since the coup d'état in 1948. The implementation of this agreement will

be greatly facilitated by the Convention and thus in finally eliminating a thorn in the side of cordial relations.

And finally, the Convention is resulting in the reopening of our consulate in Bratislava and the Czech consular office in Chicago. Our building in Bratislava is being readied for occupancy within a few months by the designated Consul General, Mr. John Dennis, an experienced career Foreign Service officer.

For me, these developments have an important personal meaning as well.

Over 25 years ago, as a young Foreign Service officer, I had the opportunity to open the American consulate at Bratislava just days before the 1948 Communist putsch. Throughout the years since, I have sought to visit Czechoslovakia as often as possible, and to remain abreast of conditions there. I happened to be there again immediately prior to and after the Soviet military intervention of 1968 which crushed the liberal dreams of the "Prague Spring."

In this regard, I was particularly struck by the fact that while no Soviet soldiers and scarcely any deaths resulted from the initial Communist putsch of 1948, 20 years of first-hand exposure to communism necessitated the use of more than half a million Warsaw Pact troops, and a good many deaths resulted from the effort to maintain communism.

Today, I can only say that I am encouraged by these announcements of improved economic and diplomatic relations between the Governments of the United States and Czechoslovakia. I hope that they are but the prelude to a time of increased contact between Americans and Czechs and Slovaks, a development which is certain to produce much more cordial ties and benefits to the two countries. Prompt Senate action in ratifying the consular convention will be most helpful in realizing this objective.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (S. 707) TEMPORARILY LAID ASIDE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, S. 707, will be temporarily laid aside and remain in a temporarily laid aside status until the close of business today.

AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 16136, which the clerk will state.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Calendar 1084, H.R. 16136, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, H.R. 16136, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$26,170,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$9,742,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, \$34,993,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, \$46,376,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$4,286,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, \$10,270,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, \$27,074,000.
Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, \$42,197,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$9,625,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, \$36,827,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, \$12,296,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$8,124,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$9,858,000.
Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California, \$1,108,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$19,078,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$2,264,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, \$9,911,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$11,936,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$17,344,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, \$3,107,000.
Fort Ord, California, \$3,660,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$7,304,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$3,906,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$16,265,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$3,360,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, \$2,497,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, \$1,030,000.
Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$541,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, \$5,388,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, \$558,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$4,726,000.
Lexington/Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$616,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$2,820,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, \$1,160,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$10,322,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, \$2,731,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, \$2,599,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, \$815,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, \$717,000.
Watervliet Arsenal, New York, \$3,256,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$3,574,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$1,859,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$7,507,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$2,023,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$8,862,000.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, \$486,000.
Various Locations, \$19,773,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratories, New Hampshire, \$2,515,000.

September 11, 1974

S 16380

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA
Fort Greely, Alaska, \$251,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$4,002,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$1,512,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$15,324,000.
Tripler General Hospital, Hawaii, \$1,205,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT
Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,358,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$16,358,000.

DINING FACILITIES MODERNIZATION
Various Locations, \$10,723,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES
UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$557,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC
Korea, Various Locations, \$5,139,000.

PUERTO RICO
Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, \$1,862,000.

KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE
National Missile Range, \$1,273,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY
Various Locations, \$148,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND
Fort Buckner, Okinawa, \$532,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE
Germany, Various Locations, \$32,355,000.
Camp Darby, Italy, \$4,159,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$84,000,000: *Provided*, That within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 103. (a) Public Law 93-166, as amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations" strike out "\$12,517,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,360,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$107,257,000" and "\$596,084,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$111,100,000" and "\$599,927,000", respectively.

Sec. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia," strike out "\$1,815,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,615,000".

With respect to "Fort Sill, Oklahoma," strike out "\$14,958,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,159,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Canal Zone, Various Locations" strike out "\$8,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,238,000".

(c) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$444,767,000;" "\$117,311,000;" and "\$562,078,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$447,768,000;" "\$118,420,000;" and "\$566,188,000", respectively.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois," strike out "\$2,750,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,650,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$182,734,000" and "\$267,931,000", respectively.

Sec. 106. Public Law 93-166 is amended in section 105 as follows:

Public Law 93-166, section 105(b), amending Public Law 92-145, section 702, clause (1) as amended, having inserted erroneous figures, is amended by striking out "\$404,500,000" and "\$405,107,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$405,000,000" and "\$405,607,000", respectively.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$361,000.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine, \$7,232,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, \$255,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$4,153,000.

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island, \$10,374,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base New London, Connecticut, \$4,971,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey, \$7,350,000.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$1,336,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$296,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval District Commandant, Washington, District of Columbia, \$2,883,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,377,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$7,706,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$14,943,000.

Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland, \$15,000,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$290,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$252,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$2,034,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$896,000.

Atlantic Command Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$633,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$3,471,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$5,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$4,990,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$1,047,000.

Norfolk Naval Regional Medical Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$15,801,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$5,602,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$1,595,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$1,534,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$446,000.

Naval Regional Medical Center, Jacksonville, Florida, \$7,417,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, \$3,239,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$8,709,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$795,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$19,448,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$4,478,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$1,561,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$1,485,000.

Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$7,112,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$200,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$15,352,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, \$3,750,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$2,564,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,284,000.

Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,888,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,080,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$1,428,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$1,953,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Regional Medical Center, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,619,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$8,371,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,011,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$11,772,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$12,943,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, \$1,048,000.
Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,238,000.
Naval Region Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$13,493,000.
Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, \$8,657,000.
Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$4,234,000.
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$2,147,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, \$1,638,000.
Naval Hospital, Lemoore, California, \$333,000.
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$77,000.
Naval Communications Station, Stockton, California, \$1,102,000.
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, \$2,301,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, \$7,697,000.
Trident Support Site, Bangor, Washington, \$103,808,000.
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, \$393,000.
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, \$2,603,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Commander in Chief Pacific, Oahu, Hawaii, \$2,700,000.
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$795,000.
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,505,000.
Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$3,356,000.
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$971,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$2,803,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$13,864,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,260,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$499,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$3,203,000.
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$1,463,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$7,271,000.
Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California, \$397,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,497,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$9,849,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$44,251,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Telecommunications Center, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$3,186,000.
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, \$947,000.
Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, \$1,026,000.

FIFTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Support Activity, Canal Zone, \$800,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$1,866,000.
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$4,193,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, \$311,000.
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$571,000.

Naval Activities Detachment, Holy Loch, Scotland, \$1,188,000.

INDIAN OCEAN AREA

Naval Communications Facility, Diego Garcia, Chagos Archipelago, \$14,802,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$728,000.
Naval Communications Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,305,000.
Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$1,782,000.
Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$907,000.
Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan, \$360,000.
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, \$1,624,000.
Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$3,741,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$1,059,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$4,038,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland," strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,391,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802 "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$244,059,000" and "\$250,924,000", respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, strike out "\$3,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,534,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,869,000" and "\$275,007,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended under the heading

"INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia," strike out "\$3,319,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,019,000".

With respect to "Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada," strike out "\$6,003,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,203,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$477,664,000" and "\$518,881,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$485,564,000" and "\$526,781,000", respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to "Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi," strike out "\$9,444,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,802,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi," strike out "\$4,532,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,466,000".

With respect to "Naval Air Station, Alameda, California," strike out "\$3,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,756,000".

With respect to "Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California," strike out "\$3,802,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,210,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$511,606,000" and "\$570,439,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$521,235,000" and "\$580,068,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$6,885,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$2,775,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base Grandview, Missouri, \$805,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,894,000.
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$11,588,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$15,873,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio, \$1,977,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$792,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$9,839,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$16,271,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, \$4,240,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$3,100,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$1,647,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$13,512,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$232,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida, \$642,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities, \$832,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, \$169,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$7,297,000.

September 11, 1974

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$298,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$7,885,000.
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$2,143,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$790,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$836,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$8,631,000.
Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$6,798,000.
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$776,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$5,849,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, \$2,500,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$310,000.
Various Locations, \$15,242,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$14,699,000.
Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$3,155,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$1,373,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$408,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$341,000.
Travis Air Force Base, Fairchild, California, \$8,800,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$11,878,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$841,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, \$675,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$3,009,000.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$2,109,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, \$1,774,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, \$323,000.
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Marquette, Michigan, \$7,050,000.
Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$835,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$3,740,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$3,038,000.
Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, \$238,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$5,595,000.
Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$115,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$882,000.
Whiteham Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$6,692,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$1,715,000.
George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, \$4,794,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,565,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$3,056,000.
Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$5,141,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$265,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, \$300,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$6,495,000.
Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina, \$730,000.
Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina, \$3,948,000.
Various Locations, \$5,194,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$2,056,000.
Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$13,700,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$13,952,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations, \$138,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$5,985,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$280,000.
United Kingdom, \$884,000.
Various Locations, \$83,081,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$4,135,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$595,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various Locations, \$1,999,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$8,100,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire upon enactment of the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. Section 609 of Public Law 89-188, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: "or if no appropriated funds are involved, has first been reported by the Air Force to the Congress in the manner set forth in section 2862, title 10, United States Code."

SEC. 305. (a) Section 301 of Public Law 93-166 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Peterson

Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado", strike out "\$7,843,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,733,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida", strike out "\$1,020,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,284,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE" with respect to "Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri", strike out "\$3,963,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,130,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND" with respect to "Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia", strike out "\$4,628,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,324,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to "Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida", strike out "\$7,039,000" in insert in place thereof "\$8,882,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi", strike out "\$8,786,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,733,000".

(7) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas", strike out "\$6,509,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,186,000".

(8) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas", strike out "\$4,211,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,461,000".

(9) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma", strike out "\$371,000" and insert in place thereof "\$895,000".

(10) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to "Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas", strike out "\$3,154,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,307,000".

(11) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to "Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma", strike out "\$1,078,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,440,000".

(12) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming", strike out "\$5,834,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,265,000".

(13) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas", strike out "\$1,165,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,200,000".

(14) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to "Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada", strike out "\$2,588,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,637,000".

(b) Public Law 93-166 is further amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "\$238,439,000" and "\$260,741,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$260,727,000" and "\$283,029,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center (St. Louis AFS), St. Louis, Missouri, \$2,573,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$670,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,862,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$394,000.

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$1,-399,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$527,000.

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio, \$572,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas, \$646,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$936,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$2,363,-000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Johnston Atoll, \$1,458,000.

Eniwetok Auxiliary Airfield, \$4,000,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family Housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand four hundred and sixty units, \$82,-396,600.

Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, four hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, one thousand units.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, sixty units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, five hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, one hundred units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred units.

United States Army Installations, Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, three thousand one hundred and fifty-eight units, \$108,778,960.

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, five hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, seven hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, five hundred and twenty-six units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, three hundred and thirty-two units.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand three hundred units, \$40,143,500.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, two hundred units.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, one hundred and fifty units.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, two hundred units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, one hundred units.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, two hundred units.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, two hundred units.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, two hundred and fifty units.

(b) Mobile Home Facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, two hundred and forty spaces, \$960,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, two hundred spaces, \$888,000.

(c) Demolition of existing structures on proposed sites for family housing:

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, \$540,000.

SEC. 502. (a) Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in section 501 of this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation (excluding demolition authorized in section 501(c)), and installation of utilities.

(b) The average unit cost for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii) shall not exceed \$29,500 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (b) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$40,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$46,000.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$20,-000,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$20,-000,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 504. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct or otherwise acquire at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units not subject to the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise. Total costs shall include shades,

screens, ranges, refrigerators, and other installed equipment and fixtures, the cost of the family unit, and the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(a) Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, two hundred units, at a total cost not to exceed \$9,600,000.

(b) Two family housing units in Warsaw, Poland, at a total cost not to exceed \$120,-000. This authority shall be funded by use of excess foreign currency when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts.

SEC. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in section 610(a) of Public Law 90-110, as amended (81 Stat. 279, 305), as follows:

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$175,500.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, one hundred and forty units, \$2,352,800.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, one unit, \$24,000.

SEC. 507. (a) Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended by (1) striking out "1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1975 and 1976", and (2) revising the third sentence to read as follows: "Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation, may not exceed: For the United States (other than Alaska and Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$235 per month for each military department or the amount of \$310 per month for any one unit; and for Alaska and Hawaii, an average of \$315 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$375 per month for any one unit."

(b) Section 507(b) of Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 676), is amended by striking out "\$325" and "seven thousand five hundred" in the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$355", and "twelve thousand", respectively; and in the second sentence by striking out "three hundred units", and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred fifty units".

SEC. 508. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing and homeowners assistance as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including demolition authorized, improvements to public quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$307,907,060.

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$935,515,-000; and

(3) for homeowners assistance under section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290), including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 to title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land

includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V, shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States \$514,187,000; outside the United States \$130,024,000; or a total of \$644,211,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$512,620,000; outside the United States, \$44,434,000; or a total of \$557,054,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$302,709,000; outside the United States, \$77,097,000; section 302, \$8,100,000; or a total of \$387,906,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$32,400,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing and homeowners assistance, \$1,248,422,060.

SEC. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (e), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum of the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that

project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

(e) In addition to other cost variation limitations contained in this section or in similar sections of prior year military construction authorization Acts, any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this and prior military construction authorization Acts may be varied upward by an additional 10 per centum when the Secretary of the military service concerned determines that such increase is required to meet unusual variations in cost directly attributable to difficulties arising out of the current energy crisis. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

SEC. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice), shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1975, authorizations for military public works including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before November 30, 1973, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North

Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1975, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 605 of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1976:

(a) Sanitary sewer connection in the amount of \$2,200,000 at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 1204), as amended and extended in section 705(a) (3) (A) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1153).

(b) Cold storage warehouse construction in the amount of \$1,215,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(c) Enlisted men's barracks complex construction in the amount of \$12,160,000 at Fort Knox, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(d) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$245,000 and bachelor officer's quarters construction in the amount of \$803,000 at Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(e) Chapel center construction in the amount of \$1,088,000 at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, that is contained in title I, section 101, of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(f) Enlisted men's barracks construction in the amount of \$7,996,000 at Fort Ord, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1135), as amended.

(g) Enlisted men's barracks and mess construction in the amount of \$699,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1136), as amended.

(h) Test facilities Solid Radar in the amount of \$7,600,000 at Kwajalein National Missile Range, Kwajalein, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1137), as amended.

(i) Land acquisition in the amount of \$10,000,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, that is contained in title II, section 201 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1140), as amended.

(j) Message Center Addition, Aircraft Five and Crash Station, Aircraft Maintenance Hangar Shops, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Mess Hall, Bachelor Officers' Quarters, Exchange and Recreation Building, and Utilities construction in the amount of \$110,000; \$199,000; \$837,000; \$1,745,000; \$377,000; \$829,000; \$419,000; and \$792,000, respectively, for the Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, that is contained in title II, section 21 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1141), as amended.

(k) Authorization for exchange of lands in support of the Air Installation Compatible Use Zones at Various Locations in the amount of \$12,000,000 that is contained in title III, section 301 of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1145), as amended.

(4) Notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), as modified by section 805(3) of the Act of November 29, 1973, Public Law 93-166 (87 Stat. 661, 681), the authorization to construct six hundred family housing units at Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, contained in title V, section 501(a) (2) of the Act of October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1148), shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975.

SEC. 606. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction index is 1.0:

(1) \$31 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$33 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior military construction authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 607. Section 612 of Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 756, 757), is amended by deleting the figure "\$150,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000".

Sec. 608. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to assist communities located near the Trident Support Site Bangor, Washington, in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities to the residents of such communities, if the Secretary determines that there is an immediate and substantial increase in the need for such services and facilities in such communities as a direct result of work being carried out in connection with the construction, installation, testing, and operation of the Trident Weapon System and that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by such communities as a result of the increased need for such services and facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the provisions of this section through existing Federal programs. The Secretary is authorized to supplement funds made available under such Federal programs to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and is authorized to provide financial assistance to communities described in subsection (a) of this section to help such communities pay their share of the costs under such programs. The heads of all departments and agencies concerned shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section on a priority basis.

(c) In determining the amount of financial assistance to be made available under this section to any local community for any community service or facility, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government concerned with the type of service or facility for which financial assistance is being made available and shall take into consideration (1) the time lag between the initial impact of increased population in any such community and any increase in the local tax base which will result from such increased population, (2) the possible temporary nature of the increased population and the long-range cost impact on the permanent residents of any such community and (3) such other pertinent factors as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

(d) Any funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, for carrying out the Trident Weapon System shall be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provisions of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1975, for carrying out the Trident Weapon System may, to the extent specifically authorized in an annual Military Construction Authorization

Act, be utilized by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the provision of this section to the extent that funds are unavailable under other Federal programs.

(e) The Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives semiannual reports indicating the total amount expended in the case of each local community which was provided assistance under the authority of this section during the preceding six-month period, the specific projects for which assistance was provided during such period, and the total amount provided for each such project during such period.

Sec. 609. (a) Public Law 93-346 (88 Stat. 340), designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, is amended to read as follows: "That effective July 1, 1974, the Government-owned house together with furnishings, associated grounds (consisting of twelve acres, more or less), and related facilities which have heretofore been used as the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, shall, on and after such date be available for, and are hereby designated, as the temporary official residence of the Vice President of the United States.

"Sec. 2. The temporary official residence of the Vice President shall be adequately staffed and provided with such appropriate equipment, furnishings, dining facilities, services, and other provisions as may be required, under the supervision and direction of the Vice President, to enable him to perform and discharge appropriately the duties, functions, and obligations associated with his high office.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall, subject to the supervision and control of the Vice President, provide for the military staffing and the care and maintenance of the grounds of the temporary official residence of the Vice President and, subject to reimbursement therefor out of funds appropriated for such purposes, provide for the civilian staffing, care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of such residence.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the foregoing provisions of this joint resolution. During any interim period until and before any such funds are so appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate services in connection with the temporary official residence of the Vice President from funds available to the Department of the Navy, subject to reimbursement therefor from funds subsequently appropriated to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

"Sec. 5. After the date on which the Vice President moves into the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution no funds may be expended for the maintenance, care, repair, furnishing, or security of any residence for the Vice President other than the temporary official residence provided for in this joint resolution unless the expenditure of such funds is specifically authorized by law enacted after such date.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed, with the approval of the Vice President, to accept donations of money or property for the furnishing of or making improvements in or about the temporary official residence of the Vice President, all such donations to become the property of the United States and to be accounted for as such.

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 202 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and (5)' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(5) the temporary official residence of the Vice President and grounds in the District of Columbia; (6) the Vice President and members of his immediately family; and (7)'.

"Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'protect the members of the immediate family of the Vice President, unless such protection is declined,' immediately after 'Vice President-elect,'; and

"(2) inserting 'pay expenses for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and accounted for solely on his certificate,' immediately after 'apprehension of criminals'.

"Sec. 9. It is the sense of Congress that living accommodations, generally equivalent to those available to the highest ranking officer on active duty in each of the other military services, should be provided for the Chief of Naval Operations."

(b) Except as otherwise provided therein, the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective July 12, 1974.

Sec. 610. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section and a corresponding item in the analysis:

"§ 2685. Adjustment of or surcharge on selling prices in commissary stores to provide funds for construction and improvement of commissary store facilities

"(a) Notwithstanding any other law the Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense may, for the purposes of this section, provide for an adjustment of, or surcharge on, sales prices of goods and services sold in commissary store facilities.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense, may use the proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) to acquire, construct, convert, expand, install, or otherwise improve commissary store facilities at defense installations within the United States and for related environmental evaluation and construction costs including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design."

Sec. 611. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 555 or 556 of title 37, United States Code, on and after the date of enactment of this section no change in the status of any member of the uniformed services who is in a missing status may be made unless and until the following two provisions have been complied with:

(1) The President of the United States has determined, and notified the Congress in writing, that all reasonable actions have been taken to account for such members and that all reasonable effort has been made to enforce the provisions of article 8(b) of the Paris Peace Accord of January 27, 1973; and

(2) the Secretary concerned notifies the next-of-kin of such person in writing of the proposed change in status, and the next-of-kin of such person has not filed with the Secretary concerned, within sixty days after receipt of notification of the proposed change in status, an objection to such proposed change.

(b) As used in subsection (a) of this section, the terms "uniformed services," "missing status," and "Secretary concerned" shall have the same meaning ascribed to such terms in chapter 10 of title 37, United States Code.

Sec. 612. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act with respect to any construction project at Diego Garcia may be obligated unless and until—

(1) the President has (A) advised the Congress in writing that all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for United States facilities at Diego Garcia have been evaluated by him; and (B) certified to

the Congress in writing that the construction of any such project is essential to the national interest of the United States; and

(2) such certification as required by clause (1) (B) of this section is submitted to the Congress and approved by joint resolution of both Houses.

Sec. 613. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Ozark Public Building Authority, an agency of the city of Ozark, Alabama, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) for use as a permanent site for the museum referred to in subsection (c), and subject to the conditions described therein.

(b) The land authorized to be conveyed to the Ozark Public Building Authority as provided in subsection (a) is described as follows: All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in sections 13 and 24, range 23 east, township 5 north, Saint Stephens Meridian, Dale County, Alabama, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which is 216.0 feet north 89 degrees 57 minutes west of the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 24, on the western right-of-way line of Alabama State Highway Numbered 249, and on the boundary of a tract of land owned by the United States of America at Fort Rucker Military Reservation;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,395 feet;

thence north 64 degrees 53 minutes west 700 feet;

thence south 25 degrees 07 minutes west 2,800 feet;

thence south 64 degrees 53 minutes east 700 feet, more or less, to a point which is on the western right-of-way line of said highway and on the boundary of said United States tract;

thence north 25 degrees 07 minutes east along the western right-of-way line of said highway, which is along the boundary of said United States tract, 1,405 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 45.00 acres, more or less.

(c) The conveyance provided for by the subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property so conveyed shall be used as a permanent site for a museum to display suitable public exhibits of the United States Army aviation equipment and allied subjects and aviation-oriented exhibits of other United States Government departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and of foreign origin, and if such property is not used for such purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to such real property shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, and to such other conditions as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe to protect the interest of the United States.

Sec. 614. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1975".

TITLE VII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 707. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$53,800,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$38,600,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$18,532,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$33,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$14,000,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. Chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, as amended is further amended by striking out the figure "\$50,000" in paragraph (1) of section 2233a, Limitation, and inserting the figure "\$100,000" in place thereof.

Sec. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Force Facilities Authorization Act, 1975."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today provides construction and other related authority for the military departments and defense agencies within and outside the United States, including authority for all costs of military family housing and the construction of facilities for the Reserve components.

The total new authority granted by the bill is \$3,027,925,060. In addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase in prior years authority of \$51,726,000 for a total authority of approximately \$3,080 million.

After careful consideration of some 601 individual construction projects at 263 major installations within the United States and overseas the committee approved an amount totaling approximately \$226,668,000 below the budget request. This is a decrease of about 8 percent in new authority.

Considering the composition of the bill, the committee considers this to be a substantial reduction, but is of the opinion the amount granted is fully adequate to provide for the construction needs of the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1975.

Again, this year, the Department placed emphasis on providing new and upgrading existing personnel facilities which they consider highly important in achieving an all-volunteer force. For example, \$392 million was requested for bachelor housing. It would provide 23,400 new spaces and the upgrading of many existing spaces; \$210 million was designated for upgrading existing and providing for some new medical facilities. This included a first increment of \$15

million for the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences, to be located near the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md. An additional \$15 million is included for the beginning of the reconstruction of this renowned medical center, which is long past due.

Substantial sums are also provided in the bill for construction for the Reserve components, NATO infrastructure, pollution abatement, and the Trident submarine support site at Bangor, Wash.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to certain matters that we believe to be of special interest.

First is the question of commissaries. The interested committees of Congress have long felt that some provision should be made to provide for the construction and maintenance of these facilities out of nonappropriated funds. Commissaries enjoy numerous advantages which allow them to reduce costs well below those of commercial counterparts. Furthermore, the patrons of commissaries pay no local sales taxes for the most part which further increases their benefits. At the insistence of Congress the Department has made a study of the matter and estimates that a small increase of 1 to 2 percent in the surcharge rate will be ample to provide for commissary needs.

With the increase in military salaries and other benefits the committee believes the time is at hand when the commissary system should become self-sustaining. Accordingly, section 610 has been included in the bill to authorize the service secretaries to adjust the surcharge rate accordingly. Three commissaries, at a cost of about \$10 million, were deleted from the bill.

Now I should like to discuss briefly the military family housing program. Considerable emphasis has been given during the past several years to providing needed on-base housing for those eligible for the assignment of such quarters. The Congress has annually approved substantial increments of new construction to eliminate the existing deficit. I am pleased to state that the Department has now turned the corner and the deficit is at a manageable level for those in grade E-4 and above who have heretofore been considered eligible for housing. The programable deficit, prior to any new authority granted in this bill, was about 12,000 units.

Of the 10,462 units comprising the Department request for new construction in fiscal year 1975, 3,000 units are for junior enlisted personnel in grades E-1 through E-3, and E-4's with less than 2 years experience who have not heretofore been considered eligible for housing.

The committee is not in full accord with this program to construct housing units for use by these one-tour young married couples. Accordingly the committee reduced the number of such units to 1,458 distributed among installations the Department deems to have the highest priority. However, in approving a reduced effort in this regard the committee will expect the Department of Defense to clearly state its policy on assignment, that these units, or any others that might be available, will not be made available

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 16387

to junior enlisted personnel who are not career oriented and have not committed themselves to an active duty career of at least 3 years. Overall, the committee reduced the requested authority for the family housing program by about \$98.9 million.

Now, finally, I want to discuss briefly the Navy's proposal to provide a support facility for a carrier task force on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

Let me review the situation briefly.

For a number of years the Navy has been anxious to establish a support facility in the Indian Ocean—more particularly on the British-owned island of Diego Garcia.

In fiscal year 1970 the proposal was made to the Congress for authority and funding for the first increment for such a facility on Diego Garcia. It was to be a communications station and a support facility for a carrier task force.

This proposal was denied by the Congress. The following year the Navy came in with a greatly reduced program to provide only an austere communications facility, which was approved by the Congress, and through fiscal year 1973 \$20,450,000 in military construction funds has been approved for this purpose. Construction work has been performed by the Seabees.

The last funding was in fiscal year 1973 when \$6.1 million was granted for dredging an entrance channel and a small turning basin for supply ships within the lagoon.

In the fiscal year 1974 supplemental authorization bill the Navy attempted to pursue their original idea further and requested \$29 million to expand the communications facility into a support facility for a carrier task force of six ships. This would require further dredging of the lagoon, the building of a general purpose and petroleum pier, additional POL storage, additional personnel facilities, and extending the runway from 8,000 to 12,000 feet. They would expect to request another \$5 million in a subsequent year.

Logistically, Diego Garcia would serve as an outpost support facility where ships could perform limited import upkeep, take on fuel and receive critical supplies by military airlift. In addition to the Navy construction, the Air Force included in its fiscal year 1975 budget request \$3.3 million for additional airlift improvements and storage space for petroleum products and munitions. The Air Force requirements are contingency related; no permanent Air Force presence is planned on Diego Garcia.

The 1972 agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom specifically authorizes a limited communications station on Diego Garcia. Technical level negotiations for a new agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom relating to expanded use of Diego Garcia by the United States were held in London February 25-28, 1974, resulting in agreed ad referendum texts of an exchange of notes that would supersede the Diego Garcia agreement of 1972. However, shortly after the ad referendum agreement was reached the Labor Party formed a new government in

the United Kingdom. As of this date the new government has not made a ministerial-level decision on the agreement.

The defense and foreign policy implications of the construction projects at Diego Garcia are, of course, broader than the \$32.2 million request would suggest. It is true that the construction of support facilities at Diego Garcia does not necessarily mean an expanded U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean. But by increasing logistic flexibility and capability, expansion of the Diego Garcia base is a distinct step in facilitating U.S. operations in the Indian Ocean, and thus is directly related to the broader policy questions associated with a U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean.

It has been suggested that the Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean area will increase with the opening of the Suez Canal. This, of course, is conjecture and remains to be seen. The date of the re-opening of the canal is of course not known, but clearance operations will be completed by January of the coming year.

After careful consideration of the many factors involved and thorough debate, the committee approved \$14,802,000 as a first increment of the Navy's requirements, and the \$3.3 million requested by the Air Force.

At the same time, the committee included section 612 in the bill to preclude the obligation of any of these funds until the President of the United States has advised the Congress in writing that he has evaluated all military and foreign policy implications regarding the need for these facilities, and has certified that this construction is essential to the national interest. However, such certification must be submitted to the Congress and approved by both Houses of the Congress. Thus, Congress will have an opportunity to focus on the expansion at Diego Garcia as a policy matter and in the light of the most recent circumstances.

Mr. President, this concludes my statement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 16136, the fiscal year 1975 military construction authorization bill, as reported from the Senate Committee on Armed Services. This bill provides authorization for \$3.079 billion for construction of facilities for active and Reserve military services.

This authorization includes work to be performed at 263 major bases and also 661 separate construction projects. The total amount approved is \$226 million less than that requested by the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, one of the key items in

the bill concerns Diego Garcia, a tiny island in the Indian Ocean, on which the Navy wishes to expand its support facilities.

The Navy originally requested \$29 million in the fiscal year 1974 supplemental bill to expand the Diego Garcia base. This request was approved by the House but our committee rejected it, feeling a matter of such importance should be more fully considered during the regular authorization process.

As a result, the Diego Garcia request became a part of the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1975.

Once again the House approved the full amount but in the pending bill the Senate Armed Services Committee has reduced the request for \$29 to \$14.8 million for the Navy and \$3.3 million for the Air Force. This sum of \$18.1 million represents only a portion of the requirements to increase the support facilities at Diego Garcia.

In recommending authorization for the \$18.1 million, the Senate Armed Services Committee has taken the unusual step of making these expenditures contingent upon subsequent action by the President of the United States, with the approval of the Congress. This has been done by precluding the obligation of the funds authorized until the President has advised Congress, in writing, that these projects are essential to the national interest. Further, the committee has provided that such certification by the President to the Congress must be approved by both Houses. This step will assure the opportunity for full debate on the expansion at Diego Garcia, as a foreign policy and defense matter.

Mr. President, the funds authorized in this bill for Diego Garcia represents a compromise position by the committee. While the Navy requested \$29 million, the committee has approved this lesser sum of \$18.1 million in order to avoid the impression of an escalation in the naval balance of power in the Indian Ocean. The committee is, in effect, merely providing for greater capability at Diego Garcia in the event the continued Soviet presence in that area requires greater U.S. naval activity there.

The Senate may recall that last year during the Arab-Israeli war and the accompanying oil crisis the President felt it necessary to place a small task force in the Indian Ocean. Because of our lack of facilities there, these forces had to be supplied by a logistic tail going all the way to Subic Bay in the Philippines.

In recent years the Soviets have been expanding their naval presence in the Indian Ocean. While we have limited support capabilities in this area, the Soviets have been active in a number of countries surrounding the Indian Ocean and they have naval facilities in Somali, Iraq, and southern Yemen.

Although Diego Garcia would not be a naval base as such, it would provide a means to support U.S. naval forces should it become necessary that they be deployed in the Indian Ocean at some future time.

Mr. President, I fully support the Navy's request and I believe that the compromise position taken by the

September 11, 1974

S 16388

Senate Armed Services Committee by an almost unanimous vote will meet most of the objections heretofore raised about this facility. In any event, the Senate will have an opportunity to debate this issue if President Ford decides to go forward and meet the requirements laid down by the committee.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that this is an important bill and deserves careful consideration by this body. The Military Construction Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), conducted extensive hearings on all elements of this bill. He was particularly thorough in placing on the public record as many facts as possible reference the Diego Garcia facility. In this committee effort, he was ably assisted by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), who is the ranking minority member of the Military Construction Subcommittee and who contributed so greatly to its work.

Also, I think we should recognize our able staff. Mr. Gordon Nease, majority counsel for the subcommittee, and his competent secretary, Ms. Joyce Topham-Campbell, have worked hard in bringing this bill in a proper form to the floor.

Mr. President, this is an excellent bill and while I would have preferred a more aggressive plan to meet the needs at Diego Garcia, I believe the proposal in this bill is a fair solution. Therefore, I would urge the Senate to give this legislation prompt attention and approval.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. President, this bill authorizes the appropriation of \$3.1 billion for the construction of military facilities, a reduction of \$200 million, in rough figures, from the administration request. It also authorizes 7,120 new units of family housing. There are obviously quite a few projects in the bill but I would like to highlight just a few.

Of considerable concern to us all is the progress being made on the all-volunteer force. This is going to be an expensive proposition, but I think most of us realized when we embarked on this course that this would happen. The administration requested \$392 million for the addition and upgrading of about 23,400 spaces in the bachelor housing program. The budget request also contained \$210 million for the improvement and addition of medical facilities. In most instances these projects were approved.

Beyond our immediate efforts to improve the medical care being received by our servicemen, the committee included \$15 million for the construction at the new Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Current plans are to utilize existing facilities for the university; however, this will seriously fragment the student and instructor popula-

tion because of the spread-out nature of the existing facilities. Clearly, in order to have adequate space, the proper teaching facilities, and a cohesive student body, new construction must be authorized. This is the first step in that program.

In addition to the above items which should have an impact on retention of servicemen, the bill contains 7,120 new units of family housing, a reduction of 3,342 units from the administration request, and several other projects relating to recreation.

The committee does, however, feel that the Department of Defense should investigate the possibility of constructing future commissaries from nonappropriated funds. It is my understanding that the Department is sympathetic to this approach, for it would take only a small surcharge in the amount of 1 to 2 percent. Since this is considerably smaller than most local taxes, which are not paid by commissary customers, this should not prove to be a burden.

Of other interest to my colleagues is the provision of \$14,802,000 to the Navy as the first increment for construction of expanded support facilities at Diego Garcia. This is a reduction to about half the original request. In addition, language was included making obligation of these funds contingent upon written notification of Congress by the President that this construction is essential to the national interest. Clearly, President Ford should have the opportunity to study this matter, but I believe from my review of the problem that such an expansion is well justified.

Some might argue that increasing American involvement in the Indian Ocean will only increase the tempo of Soviet activities in the area. But, the Soviets continue to increase their ship days anyway. Shall we sit by and do nothing? Shall we not even have the capability to respond to events in the area? Some have remarked that South Asia should remain free of the specter of nuclear arms. But the testing of a nuclear device by India recently should have removed all doubt about whether nonuclear status of the area would continue.

A final project of considerable interest is the authorization of \$62 million as the first increment of an airbase hardening program in Europe. On a recent trip to Europe it was made clear to me that this is an absolutely vital construction program. With the Soviet advantage in fighter aircraft in Europe—and I speak only in terms of numbers, not in terms of quality—it becomes even more essential that we protect those aircraft we have, from surprise attack. The Mideast wars provide a clear example of what can happen to aircraft caught unprotected on the ground.

Mr. President, I should like finally to extend my thanks to the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. SYMINGTON, for the fine job he has done in getting out what I believe to be a reasonable bill. His statesmanship in the conduct of hearings and particularly the markup on the bill is deeply appreciated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I

appreciate the remarks of the able senior Senator from Texas. As always, it is a privilege to work with him and for him on problems of our national security.

Would the Senator like to bring up his amendment at this time?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 73, insert between lines 19 and 20 the following:

Under the heading "Outside the United States" with respect to "Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy," strike out "\$3,932,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,632,000".

On page 73, line 21, after "\$477,664,000" add "\$41,217,000" and in line 23, strike out "\$526,781,000" and insert in place thereof "\$44,917,000, and \$530,481,000".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate on this matter.

I am offering an amendment today to title II, of H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill. The amendment would add \$3.7 million to the Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily. This is in reality an amendment to the fiscal year 1973 Military Construction Authorization Act, Public Law 92-545. I recognize that it is unusual for a member of the committee that reported the act to be seeking an amendment to the act, but this is an unusual case. I learned of the need for this amendment on my trip to Europe over the Labor Day recess.

At the outset, I wish to emphasize that these fiscal year 1973 construction projects form the keystone of the Navy's program to upgrade the Sigonella base so that vital logistic support operations can be carried out in support of our Sixth Fleet. Sigonella is strategically located in the central Mediterranean—its upgrade is essential in view of the trends in recent years to a predominance of Sixth Fleet operations in the central and eastern Mediterranean. The installation at Sigonella will have the capability to rapidly airlift supplies and personnel to Sixth Fleet task forces. In addition, our ASW patrol aircraft will receive support for their vital missions over the wide expanse of the Mediterranean.

Fifteen projects at Sigonella were authorized for a total amount of \$8,932,000 in the fiscal year 1973 Military Construction Authorization Act. Three of these projects in the amount of \$684,000 are being built by Seabees and there will be no problem with their completion. One fixed priced contract for a tactical support center in the amount of \$121,000 has already been completed. Of the remaining 11 projects, one was awarded by a fixed priced contract, and the other 10 were awarded to two contractors with cost escalation provisions. The inflation in Italy has been enormous—to the point that it is increasing by as much as 6 percent in a month. One course open to the

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16389

Navy and the Army Corps of Engineers, the Contracting Agency, was to terminate 8 to 10 projects in order to recoup sufficient funds to complete 1 or 2 high priority projects, and then to seek funding of the remaining projects at a significantly escalated cost in the fiscal year 1976 request.

However, there are problems with this course of action beyond those of just delaying some construction by a year. The contracts have been proceeding from 4 to 10 months and are at various stages of completion and with many items of equipment in various stages of fabrication in plants throughout Italy. It is a very undesirable situation to leave these projects in a partial state of completion on an Italian military base for a year until an amendment can be included in the fiscal year 1976 Military Construction Authorization Act.

Further should the contracts be terminated and restarted, the cost is expected to be increased by another \$5 million over the amount in my amendment.

Therefore, because of the urgency of the projects and the increased cost should we delay them, I believe it is in our best interests to amend the fiscal year 1973 Military Construction Act this year. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, I have discussed this with the chairman of the full committee, and we shall be glad to accept the proposed amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas and take it into conference.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I have a more complete statement on the bill as a whole, focusing on one particular item, that I should like to use later. For the time being, I want especially to thank the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) for the long, hard hours, days, and weeks of work that he did on this bill, and also to thank the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) for the work that he did on it as the ranking minority member.

This is a working subcommittee, and I am sure that someone will mention or has mentioned already the very valuable services, to the full committee and this subcommittee of our staff member, Gordon Nease, a long-time, highly valued member of our staff. He happens to be ill right now, a situation which is temporary, but I should not like to let any chance pass without complimenting him on his fine work.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

I was not taking his sentiments away from him, but I did not know if I would get another chance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I deeply appreciate the kind remarks made by the able and distinguished chairman of the full committee. I associate myself with the remarks he has made. I have already done so with those of the senior Senator from Texas, but I should like now to express my regret at the illness of Mr. Nease, who has been the authority in this field for many years. I, therefore, associate myself with the remarks of the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. Again, I should like to extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his kind remarks about me, and certainly about Gordon Nease. We certainly miss Mr. Nease's presence today. He has been helpful throughout the years, and we wish him a speedy recovery.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. These are not pro forma remarks which I made about my two colleagues and about Mr. Nease. We believe he will be back soon.

Mr. President, I support this bill. I have been through it. We had it up before the full committee and had a real discussion of the major parts of it. I am glad that I can and I do actively support the entire bill.

Let me say just one word about the item concerning Diego Garcia. This concerns a naval installation represented by provisions in the bill for piers, storage facilities, and related facilities.

I support that item, Mr. President, on the basis of our Nation's need and not on the basis of being anti-Soviet Russia or anything of that kind. I was convinced, not by the Navy nor by anyone else, but just by the commonsense and logic of it, that we ought to do something about this naval fueling and docking facility, with places to use as piers.

We do have a policy question involved. So the bill provides that the money is authorized, but shall not be spent until relations are more formally established with Great Britain under terms that we approve of. I shall have something further to say about that part of the bill, especially should it come under attack.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. He wants to get to these amendments, I know, and I think he is right about it. So I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able chairman. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of the quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), and other Senators, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY's amendment is as follows:

On page 113, between lines 10 and 11, insert a new section as follows:

Sec. 614. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available pursuant to this or any other Act for the construction or maintenance of facilities at the service academy of any military department may be expended by the Secretary of the military department concerned for the construction and maintenance of such facilities as may be necessary or appropriate to provide for the admission of females as cadets or midshipmen (midshipwomen), as appropriate, at such academy.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "service academy of any military department" means (1) the United States Military Academy in the case of the Army, (2) the United States Naval Academy in the case of the Navy, and (3) the United States Air Force Academy in the case of the Air Force.

On page 113, line 11, strike out "Sec. 614" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 615".

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment tracks very closely an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) and accepted by the Senate earlier this year. Of course, it has some important revisions in it, but it is an amendment which I think is justified and entirely appropriate for this particular legislation.

After it was accepted by the Senate earlier in the year, it was dropped in conference, because the House conferees did not feel at that time that it was relevant to the particular measure to which it was attached.

The amendment would permit the use of funds which are authorized for the various service academies in a way which would be consistent with establishing a policy permitting women to attend the service academies. Therefore, it is an entirely relevant amendment to the military construction program, which is concerned with authorizing and eventually appropriating money that will be used for military construction.

Mr. President, we know that women today are enrolled in a number of ROTC programs. That is so because the military forces recognize the importance of having women in the ROTC. Therefore, they take training which is similar and comparable to the training that young men take in being trained as officers. They also take such training in the OCS. They are also involved in taking courses in the service War College, which are the most important educational institutions within the Military Establishment; and there seems to be no real or convincing reason why women should not also be permitted to be enrolled in the service academies.

One point that has been raised over a period of time is, how can we expect to enroll women in the service academies when the service academies are to train people for combat forces?

The Armed Services Committee has recognized, through compilation of figures, that actually only a relatively small number of military officer positions are combat related. It varies in the different services from approximately 15 percent in the Army who are actually involved in combat-related training to approximately 30 or 35 percent in the other services, the Navy and the Air Force. There are a variety of different specialties at the service academies that women could be superbly trained and equipped for. This would also free men to serve in the combat area, particularly considering the shortfall in the combat arms area we have seen over a period of recent months. Women could be very well suited for such other responsibilities.

I am hopeful that the amendment will be accepted by the managers of the bill and taken to conference. It seems to me that during the period of recent years, we have been attempting to establish the basic and fundamental rights of women in our society. I think there are many who can play a vital role in the defense of this country and in the military forces of this Nation. This amendment would provide them the kind of excellence in training at the service academies which is being provided to the young men of this country, and I think our whole defense posture and establishment would be basically better served if that were the case.

This amendment does not mandate the admission of females to the academies. However, it does put the Department of Defense on notice that the Congress expects the Department of Defense to use its authority to make that decision. It does point out to the Department of Defense that the Congress would look favorably upon such a decision. And, most importantly, it does facilitate such a decision by authorizing the construction of whatever facilities may be necessary at the respective academies, in the view of the Services, in order to prepare for the admission of women.

Mr. President, last December the Senate passed the Hathaway amendment to the military pay bonus bill, an amendment which mandated the admission of women to the Service academies. That amendment was objected to by the House on two grounds: First, it was non-germane to the bill it was attached to; second, similar legislation in the House would receive prompt hearings.

There are in fact some six bills in the House related to the admission of women in the Service academies. However, hearings have not yet been concluded on them, nor will they apparently be concluded before an appeal has been heard in the U.S. District Court of Appeals concerning a suit that has been filed to allow two women into the Air Force and Naval academies. That appeal hearing could take several months.

In the meantime, wide bipartisan support has arisen in both the Senate and the House in favor of the admission of women to the Service academies. Some 25 Senators have publicly supported this, including the majority and minority leaders, and the chairman and ranking

minority member of the Armed Services Committee.

The Department of Defense has recognized that the power to appoint is totally discretionary:

The power to appoint persons to the academies of the Army, Navy and Air Force is a discretionary function of the President alone. Since it is entirely within the discretion of the President to determine who will be appointed to a service academy, women could be appointed by him without the need for any new legislation. None of the statutes relating to any of the three service academies requires a person to be male in order to be eligible for nomination or appointment to the academies. (May 1973 letter from Defense Department to House Armed Services Committee)

The U.S. District Court also held recently that nothing in the admission statutes indicates that males only must be considered.

The primary reason for the nonadmission of women to the Service academies at the present time is that it currently happens to be Department of Defense policy. It is also a tradition which is very reluctant to cede to modern realities.

There are two strings which academy traditionalists are holding on to in the hope of maintaining the all-male policy: First, that two laws prohibiting women from assignment to combat vessels and planes in the Navy and Air Force can somehow continue to be interpreted as also excluding women from the Service academies, since the academies train officers for combat. However, the Defense Department admits that those laws exclude women from only 30 percent of Navy officer positions, from only 38 percent of Air Force officer positions, and from no Army officer positions—since the laws apply only to Air Force and Navy combat positions, although only 15 percent of Army officer positions fall in the combat category. Thus, women Academy graduates could serve in 70 percent of Navy officer positions, 62 percent of Air Force officer positions, and all Army officer positions without any change whatsoever in current law.

The second hope of academy traditionalists is that the Congress may get so bottled up in its deliberative legislative processes that it may not be able to soon pass a law which will require the Services to admit women to the academies.

Mr. President, this amendment does not require the Department of Defense to admit women to our Nation's service academies. But it does provide the full authority to do so and it does strongly urge Department Defense to change its policy.

For the Department of Defense has already done much to provide equal opportunities for American men and women in the services. The Air Force opened its Reserve Officers Training Corps program to women in 1968, and the Army and Navy did likewise in 1973. Since initiation of the Volunteer Army last year, the Defense Department has undertaken to bring more women into the services, in a concerted effort to improve the quality, numbers, and representativeness of the Volunteer Army. Experimental programs were begun this summer, and will be greatly expanded

next year, to have men and women undergoing joint basic training. Of 430 job classifications in the Army, 400 are now open to women. Women are now being assigned to command mixed units, and women are making outstanding contributions as pilots, chaplains, technicians, mechanics, deck hands, truck drivers, and drill sergeants.

Yet, much more can be done so that our Nation can better benefit from the dedication and talent of qualified and willing women who wish to serve in our Armed Forces. A very small percentage of our Armed Forces are women, and only about 4 percent of officers are women. Women officers should not only be trained in ROTC, which provides a greater percentage of military officers than the academies, but also in the specialized academy environments which will give them superior job and career advancement opportunities. Service statistics show that academy graduates, as opposed to OCS and ROTC graduates, rise higher in the rank and pay scales.

If women officers attend all of the service war colleges, the highest level of service education, preparing officers for general and admiral rank, there is no legitimate reason why they cannot begin their careers at the military academies.

The situation becomes all the more regrettable when one recalls that a recent bill was passed in Congress allowing a Laotian general's son to attend West Point, along with other foreigners at all the academies, while American women are refused attendance. In the case of these foreigners, American taxpayers' money is being spent to train people who will not even serve in the American military, whether in a combat status or not.

Mr. President, it is time that Congress and the Department of Defense cooperated in doing the right thing for American women and our Armed Forces. After all, American women have as vital an interest in our national defense as American men do.

The military academies should be open to qualified women candidates. This can be done by a change in Department of Defense policy. The Merchant Marine Academy, under the Secretary of Commerce, has already set a precedent in receiving women applicants. This amendment will emphasize congressional intent in encouraging the Department of Defense to do likewise.

I hope my colleagues will support this modest but important amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the following related items be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Norfolk Virginia-Pilot, July 23, 1974]

THE LADY IS A MIDSHPMAN

It isn't attracting much notice, but the armed forces are fighting a bitter rear-guard action to keep women out of the service academies.

There are bills before Congress to authorize the admission of the women to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, and a change

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 16391

in the men only policies of the services is just a matter of time. (The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy has dropped its prohibition of women.)

The military could have opened the academies to women "at any time in the last 10 years or any time this year, but they have never done it and will not do it," says Representative Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Since thousands of women are serving in the military, since the Air Force opened its Reserve Officers Training Corps program to women in 1968 and the Army and Navy did likewise in 1973, and since the Defense Department has undertaken "a concerted effort to bring more women into the services" (as its general counsel testified last month to the Military Personnel Subcommittee), it is impossible to justify the exclusion of women from the academies on any grounds other than tradition. (And even such traditionalists as Senators John Stennis and Strom Thurmond are among the cosponsors of measures to open the academies to women.)

The argument that the brass makes for keeping women out is that the academies are meant to train combat leaders and women are barred from combat by law. "The issue is not whether women should become cadets at West Point; the basic question is whether Americans are prepared to commit their daughters to combat," General Frederick C. Weyand, Army Vice Chief of Staff, testified on June 19. "I am not prepared to do that. And I believe that is the sentiment of the majority of Americans."

That is the sort of talk that causes people to say war is too important to be left to generals. No one proposes to send women into the trenches. But the United States is not at war and there are important noncombatant roles for women even in wartime. That much is obvious from the part women have taken in past wars. And, as Senator Marlow Cook (R-Ky.) observed when the question was debated earlier in the Senate, "combat today may be a lady sitting at a computer at a missile site in North Dakota."

There is no good reason why women ought not to be admitted to the service academies, which is not to say that Annapolis is suddenly to become a finishing school. The midshipmen and cadets would adjust to the change a lot more quickly than the old salts and old soldiers. The military ought to accede gracefully to the inevitable.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, July 23, 1974]

ARMY TRAINING PROGRAM FOR WOMEN IS CHECKED

(By John Filliatreau)

Ft. Knox, Ky.—Alongside more than 1,600 men taking ROTC basic training at Ft. Knox this summer are two WAC career officers.

The Women's Army Corps members, Maj. Nancy E. Bird, 33, and Capt. Maria J. Stripling, 31, hold desk jobs in the 2nd Region headquarters of the Army's Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) at Ft. Knox. But at various times they're also marching with the men, throwing hand grenades, doing callisthenics and trying most other basic training staples.

How well they fare, and what they recommend when the training is over, will help determine what training is given next summer to the first women ROTC cadets attending boot camp with men at Ft. Knox.

The presence of Major Bird and Captain Stripling is a mark of the changing role of women in the U.S. Army—a role that is shifting from their traditional clerical and support function in the direction of a possible combat role.

Unlike many other nations, the U.S. is not well disposed toward the idea of women in combat. At the moment, the law says women may not be employed as fighting soldiers.

However, many Viet Cong guerrilla fighters were women, and American veterans will attest to the fact that they fought well. A recent Miss World titleholder served in the Israeli Army as a tank driver.

Women outside the military are objecting to the roles they've been forced to play in such male-dominated areas as business and politics. Few organizations have been as male-dominated as the military, and now the WACs have begun sending up smoke signals, too.

They say the new all-volunteer military is in need of qualified people and cannot afford to lose capable women by clinging to cherish stereotypes. As one WAC officer recently said, "They need the labor force . . . There's been a general awakening." Talented women just don't want to be Army career secretaries.

Major Bird, a 13-year Army veteran and Captain Stripling, who has nine years' service, may be the first women to take the U.S. Army's basic combat training with a group of men.

Women have been members of college ROTC units for several years, but the estimated 300 to 400 coming next year for boot camp along with thousands of men will be a new experience for the Army and for Ft. Knox.

"This is a far more strenuous course than ours would be," Major Bird said recently of the training which she and Captain Stripling are taking at times of their own arranging. "It's weighted in the direction of endurance . . . and the hardest parts of the training are those that have to do with actual strength, in the arms and shoulders, like the horizontal bar exercise. The bars were made for a guy's hands, they were just too big . . .

"The biggest problem was simply being out of shape. And there are problems having to do with our physical stature. We're built differently, in the pelvic area and the bust, and that makes a difference in some of these physical exercises. And there are a couple of exercises that were actually easier for me."

Major Bird, a native of Rochester, N.Y., is more concerned about what women ought to do than what they can do.

"There's a fine line between what you can do and what you should do," she said. "For example, the grenade assault course looks like a lot of fun to me. I want to do it because it's fun and it's a challenge, but this kind of training is expensive and women are still prohibited by law from taking part in combat. There is a cost factor. So the parts of training directly related to combat are still a question mark . . . This training is still up for grabs."

Major Bird does see some value in training women in combat tactics.

"It does help you to understand what the military is all about," she said. "I think it might make a woman have a little more interest in the piece of paper she's processing . . . There's no way you can lose. Even if you stayed just 24 hours you'd learn something."

According to Capt. Charles Crowley, under whose supervision the women have been training they're getting "no particular special attention . . . We do talk to the WACs every day, and this has been an educational process for us . . . The cadets have a positive attitude about it. They've more or less left them alone."

Major Bird's most firm conviction is that the women ought to train together with the men, "with some modifications of the training process."

Captain Stripling, a native of Fort Valley, Ga., and an instructor at Eastern Kentucky University, feels differently about the matter.

"If you have the women training with the men, you're going to have them competing with the men," she said. "And I think some of the women would surpass the men, and that would be a demoralizing factor . . . I don't think they should train together."

"I think we need to develop a training program that takes in the best parts of both sides of the house . . . After all, basic training isn't all there is, combat isn't all there is. We've been training volunteers (in the WAC) for 30 years for supportive roles, and women are still not going into combat arms. Yet everything here is geared to the combat role . . . I don't even think this training here applies."

Captain Stripling, whose father was a 30-year Army career man, thinks the presence of women in training camps can have a beneficial effect.

"I think when women get on the job there won't be all this role playing," she said. "There's a real difference in the way a man approaches training women. In a training mission there just can't be any difference."

The WAC branch of the Army is on the move. Since July 1, the Army has been assigning WAC officers to other Army career officer branches. This has led to suggestions that the WAC branch may be merged soon with the Regular Army.

WAC Director Brig. Gen. Mildred C. Bailey, insists the WAC branch is alive and well and will continue to play an important role in WAC officer assignments and military school selection.

She recently said the WAC branch in the officer personnel directorate of the Military Personnel Center in Washington will continue to coordinate WAC assignments with the other officer branches "until we have concrete proof that women are being properly used." She added, "I can assure you the corps will be around for a good long time."

NEW UNIFORMS BEING PLANNED

One of the current questions facing the WAC's is what their new uniforms will look like. Several are now in the testing stage.

A summer pants suit which will be part of the training uniform is undergoing testing now.

General Bailey said she is "sorry to find my women required to wear fatigues unless performing a job that justifies them. Putting a woman into uniform shouldn't rob her of her identity as a woman. I hope commanders will come to realize that it is just as important for a woman to retain her identity as it is for a man."

She added that the Army is making good progress assigning women to instructor and headquarters staffs at male training centers; but she noted that more than half the trainer personnel at the WAC Center at Ft. McClellan, Ala. are men.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, August 25, 1974]

THEY WOULDN'T HAVE MADE IT

(By Karen Peterson)

"It's fair to say that they wouldn't have made it without us," says Women's Army Corps Director Mildred Bailey.

The soft-spoken, white-haired WAC brigadier general freely acknowledges that in order to make the "all-volunteer" concept work, the Army has had to dramatically increase its number of female recruits.

In fact, if the WACs hadn't recruited 15,200 new women by June, 1974, the "new" Army itself wouldn't have met its first-year quota. The fledgling volunteer program technically would have flopped.

It has been a year since the draft expired in July, 1973. In spite of dire predictions of falling 20,000 short, the volunteer Army has just made its over-all goal of approximately 781,000. But that's in part because the WACs have steadily increased their recruitment goals to meet the need for more bodies.

"There's no doubt about it. We are helping to make the concept viable," says Gen. Bailey. At the end of 1972, total WAC strength was set at 15,500 women. By 1979, it is slated to be 50,400. (Current WACs number 24,800 as of April.)

S 16392

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 11, 1974

Here's another way to view the numbers game. At the end of 1971, WACs were less than one percent of the total Army's strength. At the end of '73, they were three percent. If things go as they're now projected, by 1979, they'll be six percent of the Army.

In addition, the WACs are getting a better educated recruit than the regular Army. To be a WAC, you have to be a high school graduate, or its equivalent in Army tests. The male Army recruits high school dropouts. It has lowered its standards to meet quotas, and in some months is taking more than 50 percent non-graduates.

Gen. Bailey comments, "Our goal now is to improve the quality of men to meet our WAC standards. If the regular Army could get high school graduates entirely, it would. Our market is different. We CAN get the graduates, and don't feel it would be in our national interest to drop our standards to meet theirs."

There are several reasons why the WACs are more than making their recruitment goals. (In June, they made 106 percent of their quota. Gen. Bailey says, "Everything is coming together now. We have an increased need for Army personnel at the same time social attitudes are changing. . . .

"When the Women's Army Corps was founded in the World War II era, serving in the Armed Forces was the patriotic thing to do. No one worried whether it was 'feminine'. Then later we saw a complete change in viewpoint, and women withdrew from 'inappropriate' fields. If they didn't, their motivations and morals were suspect."

She continues, "Now we've seen another complete reversal, and women want total participation in public life . . . Now we WACs are seeing 30 years of our hard work pay off. We're getting our share of the advertising and recruiting dollar again. The Army is paying serious attention to recruiting women."

To get young women, the WACs are doing a lot of very practical things, such as offering them money and jobs on a par with men. For example, now 250 MPs are military police-women, a number expected to double in a year. Says Gen. Bailey, "We've got women welders, plumbers, heavy equipment operators, and the like."

Of 430 job classifications, only 30 are still closed to women, and they are directly related to combat assignments, such as rifle-men. Both men and women are being urged to sign up for exotic jobs bringing a \$1,500 to \$2,500 cash bonus when training is finished. An example is missile repairman—perhaps more properly called a missile repairperson.

Opening jobs to women is one thing. Filling them with women is another. Approximately 81 percent of today's WACs are still in some form of clerical or medical work. Comments Gen. Bailey, "If we're going to have 50,000 WACs in 1979, we've just got to move them out of traditional fields, the ones they already know. We're pushing these other fields fields heavily now."

There are other reasons today's Women's Army Corps is able to attract increasing numbers of women. Court and Congressional decisions have smashed past inequities, so that the women now get more of an equal break with men. Recent Supreme Court decisions prohibited discrimination in housing and medical benefits for the families of female Armed Forces personnel. And pregnant military women are no longer summarily discharged, regardless of whether or not they're married. In 1972 Congress brought a female veteran's educational benefits under the GI bill up to those of a man.

Finally, in 1973 the WACs decided you could be married before enlisting, as well as after. Gen. Bailey says, "We're just trying harder now to adjust our regulations to a woman's family needs. Before, they weren't often considered."

But there are other inequities. The Army

does not admit women to West Point, saying that doesn't jibe with the academy's primary mission of training combat leaders. And it still doesn't give combat assignments to women—or the \$2,500 cash bonus that goes with accepting a combat slot.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, August 27, 1974]

WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: OPPORTUNITIES IMPROVE

(NOTE.—The progress of U.S. women toward true job equality is getting a close look during this National Women's Week, marking the 54th anniversary of the constitutional amendment giving women the right to vote. And nowhere are the paradoxical problems of the working woman clearer than in the military services. Uniformed women, about 3 percent of the armed forces now, have made great strides—and still face a formidable barrier in federal law. Why women join and what awaits them in the service is discussed below; at right, three senior women officers talk about their careers.)

(By John D. Moorhead)

More young U.S. women now are flicking a job-seeking glance at military service.

Perhaps their eyes are caught by the promotional campaigns telling of expanded opportunities for training and travel. Or they may want to pay off some bills when jobs are scarce, as did one woman marine interviewed recently.

In any case, the military services are looking for a few good women. Now that the draft no longer conscripts or pressures young men into the military, the volunteer Army—and the other services—need women so that they will not need so many men.

And they are getting them. The number of women in the U.S. Army has doubled since 1972 and may double again by 1977. The Air Force has boosted its force of women 20 percent in a year, and the Navy's increase over 1973 is about 40 percent.

JOB SPECIALTIES OPEN

The Coast Guard has begun to enlist women in its regular ranks. Previously they had been confined to the reserves.

Most military job specialties now are open to women, except for duties that would expose them to combat, service spokesmen say.

There are some sticking points, however: Women at present are barred from some advanced training schools directly related to combat jobs. (Federal law still bars women from combat.)

The possibility of a woman's commanding a mixed unit remains limited, although some women recently have been assigned to minor commands. Partially this is a carryover from the time when women clearly were second-class citizens in the military, officers say, because few women have had the opportunity to build the kinds of experience and diversity of training that would prepare them to hold a major command.

FURTHER LEGISLATION NEEDED

In the past, women in the military have specialized in fields such as personnel or public relations.

Ratification of the equal rights amendment would clear the way for full participation by women in all military duties, although further legislation would still be needed, officers say.

All the services say they are doing much to eliminate old restrictions. As late as 1967, there were statutory limits on the number of women in the armed services, and women could rise no higher than the rank of lieutenant colonel or Navy commander.

Now these curbs are gone. Privileges and benefits generally have been equalized for men and women.

And opportunities for women are opening up. Training is available in electronics, aircraft maintenance, avionics engineering,

military police, as well as other fields which previously were male domains. Military women now serve as pilots (on a very limited basis), tugboat technicians, deck hands, truck drivers, and auto mechanics.

The pay equals that of military men: an enlisted woman will make \$5,629 yearly when she enters the service but can expect to pull in over \$8,000 yearly by the end of her first enlistment.

Officers start at \$9,786 and after four years of service and normal promotion will be making around \$16,000 yearly. (The figures for both officers and enlisted persons include basic pay, living allowances, and tax advantages.)

The security, amenities, and adventure of military life are quite attractive to many young women, but some discrimination remains.

"There are some lingering thought processes that have to be overcome, with women as well as with men," says Navy Capt. Alice Marshall. "Women have to adjust their own attitudes."

"Some of the men have never worked with women before, and if they tend to think not too highly of women in the military then it is harder," she continues.

RESTRICTIONS CHARGED

Says a spokesperson for the Massachusetts Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, "It is very difficult for women to get truly professional training in the military. For women going into the service as a career, most areas are a closed door."

Married women in the military face special problems. (The Army and Air Force estimate that about 30 percent of their women are married, whereas the Navy says 14.8 percent of its women officers and 12.8 percent of its enlisted women are. A very small percentage of these have children, the services say.)

If both husband and wife are in the armed forces, the military generally makes an effort to assign them to the same duty station. This is easiest if both belong to the same service.

"If you fall in love, try to make it an Army man," Brig. Gen. Mildred C. Bailey, director of the Women's Army Corps, tells her troops.

ON ACTIVE DUTY

"We guarantee that women will not be separated from the family any more than the man," General Bailey says.

Military women who become pregnant may in most cases remain on active duty, as long as their performance is good and remains so, military officers say. This includes unwed mothers.

The Marine Corps, however, reserves the right to discharge military mothers. But even here a woman can remain on active duty if her special petition is approved by Headquarters Marine Corps.

The lot of a woman in uniform is better than it has ever been, most observers agree, but she still does not stand toes-on-the-line equal with the man under arms.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, August 27, 1974]

THREE WHO CAME UP FROM PERSONNEL

A pioneering experience, a daily struggle to prove personal worth, and a deeply satisfying challenge.

This is the picture drawn by three senior women officers in the U.S. military about their careers, spanning a time when service-women have moved rapidly toward real equality with their male counterparts.

"During World War II women did anything that would free men for combat roles, but when the war ended, almost overnight a curtain was drawn before us," says Brig. Gen. Mildred C. Bailey, a 32-year Army veteran.

"Women who were willing out of patriotism to come into the armed forces became suspect. We've spent 30 years trying to reverse this," she said in a recent interview.

For Navy Capt. Alice Marshall, who en-

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16393

tered the service in 1952, the struggle has not been so visible: "I have always felt my opportunities in the Navy were significantly greater than for most of my college counterparts in civilian occupations."

"You really didn't think in terms of discrimination," says Air Force Col. Billie M. Bobbitt of her 23-year career. "Most of us accepted it as a way of life."

General Bailey, trained as a teacher, came into the Army during World War II and stayed on. Though she has found her work satisfying, she speaks of the "humiliation, the constant proving of oneself, trying to be better than the man."

Most of her career was spent in public relations, she says, although she also did personnel work and served 13 years in intelligence.

General Bailey now is the director of the Women's Army Corps. She is the second WAC officer to reach the rank of brigadier general.

After working in radio and television as a civilian, Captain Marshall received a direct appointment as a Navy ensign in 1952. Her first duty station was as a communications watch officer in San Francisco during the Korean war.

"That was a busy time and I enjoyed it," she recalls.

Most of the rest of her career has been spent in the public relations or personnel fields.

In the late 1950's, she attended the general line officers' school then operated in Monterey, Calif.

"The men helped us with damage control, and we coached them on personnel procedures," she says of the experience.

In the middle 1960's, she served as flag secretary to the U.S. fleet air commander in the Mediterranean. "I also served as inspector general and traveled all over Europe and the Middle East," she says.

She now is head of the services and benefits branch at the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington.

In 1951, Colonel Bobbitt received a direct commission in the Air Force based on her civilian experience in education and school counseling.

Her work since has been primarily in personnel. "I've worked for good people and always had challenging jobs," she says.

"I came in at a time when a military career was really not an acceptable alternative for a woman. Now it offers a much more normal life for women," she says.

Two of the more unusual tasks she has been given during her career were the assignment to activate a maintenance and supply group in 1955-56 and a five-year stint as a special agent for the office of special investigations.

[From Time magazine, Aug. 26, 1974]

SKIRTS AND STRIPES

With her short hair, decisive manner, and well-pressed Army greens festooned with ribbons, Colonel Nancy Hopfenspirger, 43, is every inch an officer. As she strides across the U.S. Army base at Würzburg, West Germany, each day, G.I.'s snap to attention and the local employees murmur a respectful "*Guten Morgen*."

As the new deputy commander of Würzburg and of various support units in an area covering nearly one-third of southern West Germany, Hopfenspirger is one of a growing number of women to step into important command assignments. Colonel Frances Weir, 47, issues orders to a mostly male outfit at the support battalion in Fort Jackson, S.C. Colonel Georgia Hill, 49, is head of the sprawling supply depot at Cameron Station, Va.

Until a year ago, female officers could command only other members of the Women's

Army Corps (the WAC). The Army, however, is now reassigning women permanently to previously all-male branches. Brigadier General Mildred C. Bailey, chief of the WAC, last month finished turning over all its personnel files to the women's new units. At the same time, the Army has reclassified 136,000 jobs, opening them to women. Thus there have recently been a myriad of female firsts on various bases: the first female parachute rigger, the first turbine-engine maintenance woman, the first female drill sergeant. Actual combat is still barred to women, though that too may change if the Equal Rights Amendment is passed.

Female integration into formerly male units is not easy. As a former battalion commander at Fort Carson, Colo., explains: "A soldier's day doesn't end at 5 p.m. There are assignments like guard duty with a rifle, charge of quarters, and special police handling of burly drunks." Women formerly rose through the ranks only within the WAC. Now they are competing directly with men for promotions. The seeding into various Army branches of senior WAC officers, some of whom have been lieutenant colonels for more than a decade, is especially difficult. Many fear a hostile reception in the regular Army; a few are even retiring rather than make the switch. Younger women, however, seem to welcome the new challenges.

This quiet revolution came about chiefly by necessity. With only volunteers to choose from, the Army needs all the recruits it can get, female as well as male. The response has been excellent: 14,000 women have joined the Army this year up from 5,200 in 1971. In the other armed services, too, women have been given a broader spectrum of jobs. The Air Force now has 17,800 women, compared with 12,265 five years ago. There are 16,500 women in the Navy, up from 8,636 in 1969. Only in the Marines which needs fewer volunteers, has the number of women remained relatively constant (about 2,700).

Few of the new female recruits are signing on to become commanders. Military life is often the best deal they can get in a tight job market. A high school graduate who enlists as an Army private can get a salary of \$326.10 a month, on-the-job training, free room and board and security. Re-enlistment rates are very high, partly because every servicewoman earns the same pay as a male of the same rank—an equality rare in the civilian world.

[From NBC Sunday Night News, Sept. 1, 6:30 p.m.]

U.S. ARMY COED BARRACKS

ROWAN. Women in the United States Army are nothing new as we all know. But women living in the same barracks as men in that same United States Army, well that is something new as we learn in this report from Pat Thompson.

PAT THOMPSON. The military life has always been thought of as the ultimate stronghold of the male. This is part of the new military which the Pentagon is trying to sell to volunteers.

This is D Company at Fort Benjamin Harrison. It's different not only because it's made up of personnel from all services attending the Defense Information School, but it also has both men and women. Even more unusual is the fact that both the men and women live in the same barracks. They're not the same kind of barracks most veterans remember, they're made up of individual rooms like those found in a college dormitory. Men share rooms right next to women.

PFC LANETTE FISCHER. Well my mother's first reaction to—when I told her we were going coed she was under the impression it was one floor has females, one floor has males and this sort of thing. And in a phone call a little while later I had said, well the ser-

geant next door, the male sergeant next door. And she said, the what, in the phone call and it really threw her for a loop.

THOMPSON. The men and women spend a lot of time together. They eat most of their meals close together, then classes together and they relax together. This togetherness has had some predictable results.

This couple Navy Seaman James REATHL and Army Private Lee LONG met in the barracks and now they're going to get married next week. Some old Army types don't like to see this, uniformed personnel holding hands while on duty. But it's all part of the new military.

Seaman REATHL. I think it's a much more realistic way to live. I think it's definitely a good step for the military to take, it shows that they're keeping up with changes, that are taking place in America, I think, today.

THOMPSON. Airman James LEWIS has mixed emotions about the coed life style. He likes it but it also presents a special problem for him.

MAN. Now you are married, how does your wife feel about it?

Airman JAMES LEWIS. Well my wife doesn't really know that this is a coed dorm.

THOMPSON. The Army feels that the experimental program at Fort Benjamin Harrison has worked so well that it will mix the sections in most of the units at the Indiana base in October.

One of the women who will be affected by this says she wants good substantial locks on her door. But she's definitely in the minority.

PAT THOMPSON. NBC News.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Sept. 1, 1974]

ARMY APPLAUDS ITS WOMEN AS "DAMNED GOOD SOLDIERS"

(By Claude Lewis)

A couple of years ago it clearly would have been a matter for laughter. But no more. Today's Army—or at least a part of it—has gone soft.

Over at Ft. Dix in N.J. nearly two dozen women soldiers moved in with the men, last week, filling the air with an odd mixture of after-shaving lotion and hairspray.

Once Army barracks were filled with cheesecake pin-ups of Marilyn Monroe and Jane Russell. That was the real Army, man!

But now the pin-ups are liable to be centerfolds of actor Jim Brown or Burt Reynolds, as women begin fixing up their rooms in the same barracks with the male soldiers. Rules require that men and women stay on separate levels.

But if soldiers are trained to crack the iron curtain what's to stop them from infiltrating a back stairwell and doing what comes naturally?

"We're all adults and everyone knows right from wrong," a sergeant said at Ft. Dix the other day. He didn't even crack a smile.

"Yeah," beamed a GI, eyeing a pretty soldier. With girls as attractive as some of those joining the Army, it's no wonder the military reaches its quotas so often.

Actually, women in the Army are no joke. In many cases they are proving to be superior to men, in education, and in basic training.

Department of Defense policy dictates that all females in the military must be high school graduates. As for men, they merely have to be able to chew gum and walk at the same time.

If women still suffer from discrimination in civilian life, the all-voluntary army promises them equal opportunity.

They are joining the army in unprecedented numbers and, according to army officials, are proving to be "damned good soldiers."

In addition, said Maj. Gen. Charles Hixon, "women have had a tremendous effect on the

male population." The men are said to be trying to keep up with their female counterparts.

"The women . . . in the first week of training, they're all in step," Maj. Gen. Hixon insists. "They're easier to train, oh yes. When we say jump, the question they ask is: Is that high enough?"

There is even a bit of healthy rivalry and snobbishness between male and female recruits, especially since all females must hold high school diplomas and since tests given women who are generally more stringent than those taken by men.

A female soldier explained recently:

"The women do better than the men, definitely. For one thing we have to be smarter. We have to be in better physical health . . . we're just more intelligent."

With the new all-volunteer army and no U.S. involvement in a hot engagement, today's war stories will probably read like something out of Romance Magazine. Now that the sergeant may be a female, who's going to bother about signing up for overseas duty?

Army Private Jill Whisker, 22 of Savanna, Ill., said she liked the coed living arrangements. "It's natural," she smiled. Pvt. Whisker, who attended Illinois State University, said the arrangement at the school was pretty much the same as the army's.

"It worked out fine," she said. "It's a brother and sister kind of thing. We look out for each other."

The whole thing sort of makes me yearn for the military life. I understand they've even raised the pay. What a way to go to war!

[From the Baltimore News American,
Sept. 3, 1974]

SHE FLIES INTO HURRICANE

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—Judy Neuffer looks at herself as a woman who has been in the right place at the right time, twice.

The first was when the Navy opened flight training to women.

The second came on Sunday when she was in the pilot's seat of a Navy P3 weather reconnaissance plane which penetrated the eye of Hurricane Carmen, with its winds of 175 miles per hour.

The 25-year-old lieutenant from Wooster, Ohio, thus became the first woman pilot in naval history to fly into a hurricane's eye.

"I didn't know what to expect, but I think I can honestly say I didn't feel fear," she said. "I have lots of confidence in the aircraft and in the crew. They know their job and they know it well."

She also was helped by the commanding officer of the four-engine turboprop jet. Cmdr. Dick Sirch, an experienced hurricane hunter who supported her and briefed her on what to expect.

Sirch said she compares well with other new pilots.

"Basically, she did a super job," he said. "When I found out I was getting a woman pilot, I expected a tomboy or a woman's libber. This is just a young lady who seriously wants to be a pilot. She knows she's being observed as a new breed, so she makes an extra effort to do as well as she can."

Lt. Neuffer has been in the Navy for four years since graduation from Ohio State University. Her first assignment was at a computer center in San Diego.

When the Navy opened its flight program to women, Lt. Neuffer, the daughter of a World War II fighter pilot, rushed to apply.

"I had spent most of my life around airports because my father has worked at or managed airports since the war. Flying's in my blood," she said.

"I was surprised when I got this assignment. But I wanted weather work, so I took the chance, and I made it."

The Navy's five other female pilots are all in the cargo transport division.

She says she didn't begin her flight train-

ing "to prove a point, advance women or fight for my rights. I'm in it because I enjoy flying. I looked at myself as a pilot trying to do what I've been trained to do."

"I don't consider myself a women's libber, but I do believe in equal opportunity. I know many people are watching me to see how I do. I won't get up on a soap box and speak out, but I hope my performance as a pilot can speak out for me."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment, which was, as I say, initially submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maine and is now offered by myself and him, will be accepted by the managers of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator include my name as a cosponsor?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) be included as a cosponsor of the amendment, as well as the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. President, today I am joining with Senator KENNEDY in introducing an amendment to the military construction bill. This amendment would authorize the construction funds for the service academies to be used for whatever construction might be necessary to admit women to the academies.

I have already introduced a bill in the Senate that would allow women to be admitted to the service academies. This bill was introduced last summer, and passed the Senate without opposition in December as an amendment to S. 2771, the enlistment bonus bill. The other cosponsors of the amendment to S. 2771 were Senators THURMOND, JAVITS, and MANSFIELD, and the amendment had the active support of Senator JOHN STENNIS, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Thus, the amendment had the support of both the chairman and the ranking Republican of that committee. That amendment was deleted from S. 2771 in the House Armed Services Committee by a margin of one vote under circumstances which gave rise to exasperation on the part of some of the members of that committee.

I have more recently introduced a substitute amendment to my original bill which contains some technical changes. This amendment has the support of a large number of Senators, including Senators DOMINICK, JACKSON, GOLDWATER, NUNN, and HUGHES, all of whom are on the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as the original cosponsors of the amendment to S. 2771.

Mr. President, the best military training in the world takes place at the American Service Academies. This training is available for men, some of whom are not even American citizens. It is not available for American women, no matter how well qualified they may be.

The service academies have never

satisfactorily explained the reason for this discriminatory policy. They say it is because the mission of the academies is combat training, but most of the training which takes place at the academies is not combat related, and no reason has ever been advanced as to why women are not allowed to receive academy training for the noncombat roles they have been filling in the services for many years. The Department of Defense made the following statement in its report on S. 2351, my bill in the Senate to allow women to be admitted to the academies:

There are numerous officer billets in the armed services, other than in combat roles which are necessary to the effectiveness of the military services. Competence in these positions is no less important than in combat roles.

Surely the best training for these non-combat roles is also to be found at the service academies. For the good of morale of the services, as well as because of our own beliefs, that training should be equally available to all.

The second reason most often given for excluding women is the expense of remodeling the facilities to accommodate them, but women have been accommodated in the Regular Army without any particularly burdensome expense. Furthermore, any remodeling expense would be trifling compared to the overall cost of operating the academies.

The purpose of the amendment I am offering today with Senator KENNEDY, however, is to make it clear that there is no longer any economic excuse whatsoever for excluding women from the service academies. We feel it is time to act. We have removed discrimination in many other areas. It is time to remove it in this area as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in Newsweek on September 9, 1974.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMY: FALL IN!

It's enough to make an old topkick tear his hair. The Army basic-training center at Fort Dix, N.J., has succumbed to the sexual revolution. Specifically, Building 5406, a three-story, cinderblock structure designed as a 160-man barracks, now houses fifteen men and eighteen women, making it the Army's first permanent coed barracks.

So successful has the experiment been, says the brass at Fort Dix, that by the end of October, all 326 WAC personnel will be reassigned to previously all-male barracks on the post. The cost of converting Building 5406 was "minimal," requiring only strong locks on the doors to the third floor, where the women are billeted, and a 24-hour guard at the stairway to the second-floor, where the men sleep. Mingling of the sexes is confined to the first-floor day room (pool tables, Ping Pong, TV).

So far, all personnel seem to be pleased with the arrangements. "You get more of a feeling of belonging to a unit," says Pvt. Betty Ruiz. The men, predictably, would like expanded visiting rights, but there seems to be little danger of their taking too many liberties. The eighteen tradition-shattering women in Building 5406 belong to the post's military-police battalion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment of the

distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished junior Senator from Maine with the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, and we will be glad to take the amendment to conference.

May I say, speaking for myself, that I think it is a constructive amendment, and would look forward to being able to sustain it with the House of Representatives.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I appreciate that sentiment. When we have a statement of support by the floor manager, we probably should remain quiet, but I wish to underline one point: that there is nothing compulsory in this amendment whatsoever. It is a reaffirmation by the Members of the Senate of our own belief in the importance of providing this kind of training for young women. There is absolutely nothing compulsory; it is completely discretionary to the military forces, but it is a clear indication of the sentiment and feeling of the Members of Congress on this particular issue.

I appreciate the expression of support on the part of the floor manager, and I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me merely for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I have already gone on record as supporting an amendment of this type. But I do want to point out to him that the manager of the bill in the conference, who would be the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) could well be up against a stone wall in the conference on this matter because the House has heretofore said that it violated their own rules, and maybe these rules of germaneness—I say maybe—and then maybe somebody someday will add up the number of Senate amendments adopted by conference and open a score against the whole committee.

I am not against the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has been very cooperative and understanding. He has had some good amendments, and we brought back all of them we could. I do think this presents a problem and I thought it just ought to be frankly mentioned here. These military bills that have to pass in one form or another—and this is one of them—are pretty handy things to hang an amendment on. It leads to delay and trouble.

So I thank the Senator for his remarks, and I would support his amendment on its merits.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the expression of the Senator from Mississippi. I do think there is a difference in this legislation from an amendment that went on the military pay bonus bill last year. Even though that was a clear expression of the Members of the Senate in support of the purposes of that amendment, we are now dealing with military construction, and I think this amendment is entirely appropriate to be attached to this particular proposal. Hopefully, with that distinction which, I think, is an extremely powerful one, and with

the clear and persuasive voice of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Missouri in defending the Senate's position, perhaps we will be able to achieve the purposes of this amendment. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of H.R. 16136 it be in order that a separate vote occur on section 612 of the committee substitute prior to the vote on the entire committee substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do this, Mr. President, because I think this is a good bill, and I think the committee has been assiduous and exacting in its study of the needs of the Nation in the field of military construction, and I want to show my support—and I am sure the entire Senate will—in the way in which this committee has worked under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) as well as the ranking Republican members, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower).

It would be my intention at an appropriate time to ask for the yeas and the nays on this amendment, and also on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1854

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I would like to call up my amendment No. 1854.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 93, after line 24, insert a new section as follows:

Sec. 509. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for the purpose of installing air-conditioning equipment in any new or existing military family housing unit in the State of Hawaii.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, my amendment to the Military Construction Act would prevent the Department of Defense from requiring that central air-conditioning be installed in military family housing in Hawaii. This requirement, which had been opposed by the three military services as unnecessary, is a horrible example of unnecessary Federal spending caused by excessively rigid regulations.

The Department of Defense claims that climatic conditions on Hawaii result in a large number of hours each year during which there are uncomfortable

temperatures on the islands. The Department's criterion is based on the number of hours where the wet bulb temperature exceeds 67 degrees Fahrenheit during the 6 warmest months.

But the Navy advised its Washington headquarters that the DOD criterion ignores the prevalence of cooling trade winds on Hawaii which consistently moderate both temperature and humidity conditions. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's finds are that in Hawaii "summers are warm but not hot, so that air-conditioning is a luxury rather than a necessity." The Hawaii Department of Planning and Economic Development describes the climate in its pamphlets as "ideal" and "generally warm and pleasant the year round." According to the General Accounting Office Report which recommends termination of the DOD requirement, air-conditioning is not common in Hawaii and is often only available as a luxury option on homes costing from \$80,000 to \$90,000.

In my judgment, there are two very sound reasons to prohibit the requiring of the installation of central air-conditioning in these military quarters in Hawaii. The first is cost in a tight budget situation. The GAO estimates that the air-conditioning program, excluding any future maintenance changes, could cost as much as \$100 million. When we are seeking ways to cut the Federal budget to help control inflation, there can be no justification for spending \$100 million on air-conditioning homes where climatic conditions are close to ideal.

The second sound reason is that the air-conditioning program is totally inconsistent with the very necessary effort to continue to conserve energy. Additional air-conditioning on such a widespread basis would create a significant increase in Hawaii's energy consumption. At the moment, most of Hawaii's electric power comes from imported oil. The GAO concluded that the DOD's policy of air-conditioning all military housing on Hawaii would be "a luxury that Hawaii's energy sources, at this point in time, cannot afford."

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I discussed the amendment of the able Senator from Delaware with my colleagues and the ranking member of the full committee and the subcommittee on the other side of the aisle, and we would be glad to accept this amendment and to take it to conference.

If I get the figures straight, we believe it would affect 1,900 housing units at a cost of about \$2 million. But we will accept the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am happy that the committee will accept this amendment. All I can say on the figures is that a study made by the Comptroller General of the United States put the cost at up to \$100 million.

I think one also has to face the fact that there would be expensive maintenance costs, not only initial construction costs. Most American families today are paying for their own air-conditioning, and it would just be unconscionable, whatever the cost, to spend this money for this purpose at this time.

I am happy that the committee is accepting this amendment and I will say that I will be following this matter very carefully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on a separate vote on section 612 of the committee substitute. That is what I mentioned before.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place in the bill, the following new section to read as follows: "Sec. —. None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be used for site acquisition or construction of the CONUS Over-The-Horizon radar system receiver antenna during the period after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to May 31, 1975."

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have taken this amendment up with the distinguished manager of the bill.

The amendment which I have called up today has a simple and limited purpose: that of obtaining sufficient time to resolve a number of questions which have been raised concerning the proposed site of the receiver antenna for the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter radar system in Washington County, Maine.

For several years, the U.S. Air Force has been investigating possible sites in Maine for the radar system. However, it was not until June 25—after Senate passage of the Military Procurement Authorization bill—that the Air Force announced the selection of a "preferred" transmitter site in western Maine and a receiver site in eastern Maine.

The receiver site, including 1,000 acres of valuable farmland, has generated the most concern among Maine citizens. The land in question produced 6 percent of Maine's total blueberry crop, with an estimated annual cash value of \$347,000.

As a result, Maine citizens and State officials seek adequate opportunity both to point out to the Air Force the adverse economic impact of the selected site and to solicit from the Air Force information as to the availability and cost of alternative sites which would still meet the technical requirements of the system.

Public hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement are being held this week in Maine, and the Air Force has encouraged public comment. At the same time, however, there are indications that development of the proposed site is proceeding apace. Therefore, the

hearings may not provide an adequate opportunity for Maine citizens to convince the Air Force of the importance of the land in question to our economy. The purchase of land options on some tracts involved in the system are scheduled to take place prior to the hearing. Also, potential contractors were requested on July 25 to submit detailed proposals and cost estimates on site development.

This amendment is intended simply to limit any further action on site acquisition and development for the prototype receiver until additional information on the matter of site selection is obtained. It is not intended to prevent the Air Force from proceeding with development of the radar technology and other research activities associated with the OTH system.

Mr. President, this amendment is very similar to an amendment which I introduced on August 20 to the Defense Procurement Appropriations bill that was accepted by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) who floor-managed that bill. This amendment differs from my previous amendment only in that it provides that no moneys authorized in any earlier legislation—as well as in this legislation—shall be used for site acquisition or construction of the over-the-horizon radar system receiver antenna during the period from the date of enactment of this act until May 31, 1975. And the additional language is necessary, for I understand that the Air Force may use within the next few weeks money authorized in the fiscal year 1973 Military Construction Authorizations bill for site acquisition of the radar system receiver antenna.

Mr. President, let me emphasize again that I do not oppose the over-the-horizon radar system. However, I do favor a temporary delay in the funding for its site acquisition and construction in order to assure that Members of Congress and the citizens of Maine have ample opportunity to resolve the questions which have been raised.

Mr. President, I understand the distinguished floor manager has considered this amendment and is willing to accept it for the limited purposes I have described.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have discussed this amendment with the ranking member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, and we are glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank my good friend from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATHAWAY). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to section 611 of the Military Construction Act. This section of the bill is directed toward the continuing problem of our men missing in action as a result of their performance of service in Southeast Asia.

In our obligations to these men, and in our treatment of their brave families, the Government of the United States has been insufficiently forthcoming. The

problem is of course a difficult one, and the intransigence of the other side has been responsible for our inability to obtain an adequate accounting of our men. But it is also true that there have been continuing efforts in the executive branch since the signing of the Paris Accords to put the problem on the back burner, and to deprive the American people of a clear idea of what has been done on behalf of our missing men, what is being done, and what is contemplated for the future.

I have met with the families of many of these men, and I know the uncertainty and doubt which plague their every day. They want to know the fate of their loved ones. And they want to know the truth. They have no wish to precipitate world war III over the issue. What they want is honest, straightforward treatment. And, sad to report, they have not been getting it. When they heard the oft-repeated statements of the previous administration that our prisoners have been returned, they were understandably upset.

I cannot understand the unwillingness to level with these families. Their husbands and fathers fought, and many of them died, for their country. We have the most serious kind of obligation to these families, but all they get is a run-around. They deserve better, and it is a shame that they have not received better.

Every family is concerned about the question of status review changes and presumptive findings of death. There are many wives and parents and sons and daughters who feel these changes are unwarranted unless and until it is conclusively demonstrated that the United States has done everything reasonable to obtain an accounting of our missing men. I think the families are entitled to postpone status review changes and presumptive findings of death until such time as their Commander in Chief can assure them that all reasonable action has been taken, and until more satisfactory permanent legislation providing clear-cut procedures for status change reviews has been enacted.

This is just an interim amendment attached to the Military Construction bill—interim treatment to clear the air of all the confusion we have had with the various court decisions and administrative procedures, or lack of them, in the past months and years.

Accordingly, section 6 provides that, first, no status changes concerning our men missing in action as a result of their performance of service in Southeast Asia may be made until the President of the United States notifies the Congress, in writing, that all reasonable efforts have indeed been made to account for our missing men in Indochina and to enforce the provisions of article 8(b) of the Paris Peace Accord.

I would note at this particular point that President Ford while Vice President, met with these families just a couple of months ago. The former President did not. We have been trying to arrange a meeting for the families with Mr. Ford now that he is President, so these families can ascertain the policy as it will be

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16397

followed by the new administration, and so they can be assured that this matter is on the front burner with our new President. I have talked to the White House about it, and I realize it is difficult given all the different concerns that confront the new administration. But the White House is trying to arrange such a conference. I think the requirement is that we get in black and white exactly what was done and what is and will be done, to clear our minds and consciences as the people's representatives that something is being done, and what it is.

Obtaining a full accounting of our men is admittedly difficult. Every action has a reaction, and the consequences have to be taken into consideration. Dr. Kissinger tells us that the Soviets are being pressured to use their influence in Hanoi. I hope the pressure is maximum, but I have no conclusive evidence that it is. It would seem to me, for instance, that the measure proposed by the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) to use our control over trade with the Communist countries to force pressure on Hanoi is eminently reasonable when we are talking about the possibility of American men still being held in prison in Southeast Asia.

Section 611, which has the support of 27 cosponsors, provides simple legal procedure for the next-of-kin to stop what they feel are unwarranted status changes. It provides a clear procedure, where there is only uncertainty and confusion now. I have yet to talk to one person, in government or out, who can tell me just what the policy is, in light of Defense Department regulations, past practice, judicial interpretations and orders, and all the rest. Small wonder that the distraught wives and families are confused about how the system works. To overcome this confusion section 611 substitutes the following procedures: The Service Secretary concerned would notify the next-of-kin, in writing, of the proposed status change. The next-of-kin would then have a period of 60 days to file an objection to such change. The objection being filed, no status change would be allowed.

There are, then, two integral parts to this measure. One would require the Presidential assurance that all reasonable efforts have been made. And the second would provide the families with the mechanism to block what they consider unwarranted changes in status.

Mr. President, section 611 of the bill is not intended to set policy for all time to come. Efforts are being made in the Congress to change the permanent legislation under which status reviews are conducted, specifically sections 555 and 556 of title 37 of the U.S. Code. This permanent legislation has proved inadequate to the current situation. Indeed it seems that sections 555 and 556 were initially enacted for the purpose of continuing pay and allowances—and not for the more serious purpose of making death determinations. A new law, addressed to the procedures of status review changes for the purpose of death findings, is long overdue. Such legislation should include specific guidelines and procedures. It should provide more access to the facts

for the families of the missing men. It should include clear-cut determinations of such terms as "next of kin." It should protect more fully the rights of the servicemen and the rights of the families.

While efforts to formulate more adequate permanent legislation go forward, it is imperative that we have interim procedures which will protect the rights in question and which can be easily understood by all parties concerned. That is the purpose of section 611.

Once the Presidential determination has been made in accordance with section 611, the families have the option available to them. Those families who feel that more evidence is needed—who feel that a status change at that particular time is unwarranted—are given the legislative tool to prevent the change. Those who wish to proceed with the determination, satisfied with the available evidence, may do so.

This is the only equitable approach. I have studied this matter long and hard and tried to look at it from every possible perspective. I believe that section 611 provides the best method for carrying us through this difficult period until more satisfactory permanent methods are provided. It recognizes our continuing obligation to our missing men, and it provides their families with the flexibility they need, and deserve, in dealing with this all-important matter.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager of the bill for his cooperation, and particularly his leadership on the Committee on Armed Services. The families of the missing in action are really indebted and grateful to him, for his leadership, and willingness on a military construction bill to try to include this as an interim measure. We know it is legislation. We know it could conceivably be questioned in the other body. But we hope the urgency of the matter will really outweigh the parliamentary problems. We are deeply indebted to the senior Senator from Missouri.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News on this particular point, which really clarifies the dilemma we are in on this score.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, August 19, 1974]

MIA PROBLEM BLAMED ON HANOI

"Noteworthy among the foreign policy guideposts in President Ford's address to Congress was his avowed determination to see 'the observance of the Paris Agreement on Vietnam.'"

"Though this general statement did not single out any specific evasion of Hanoi's commitments, the wives and families of the 1100 men still carried as missing in action must hope that it implies a presidential concern for the anguish they have suffered and a fresh resolution to bring to an end as promptly as possible the plaguing uncertainty about their fate."

"The bitterness felt by some relatives of the MIAs is tinged with suspicion that the government has not done all that it might or ought to have done to secure an accounting as provided for in the Paris cease-fire. . . ."

"Yet the hard fact is that, short of some

new diplomatic stroke gaining Hanoi's and Viet Cong compliance with their humanitarian obligations, the outlook for either recovering those who may still be alive or for finding proof of their deaths is tragically dim. Even under the best of Communist cooperation, the task of finding the remains of men missing as long as six years ago is exceedingly difficult. The U.S. never recovered the bodies of some 78,000 men who died in World War II. And now in the Vietnam aftermath, search operations, having been hampered by Communist refusal to permit teams access to disputed areas in the south as well as in the north, have had to be suspended since an ambush last December of an American search team.

"These obstacles pose dilemmas for responsible Defense Department officials as well as for MIA families. For families still clinging to a hope that husbands or fathers might still be alive, any haste to reclassify them as officially dead in the absence of fresh information can seem cruelly insensitive—if indeed not a yielding to temptation to dispose of a problem with expedient record changes in lieu of harder and persistent diplomatic pressures."

"A federal court panel ruled last February that the Pentagon can no longer declare dead those servicemen still listed as missing without notifying next-of-kin and giving them a chance to be heard. While upholding claimants' contentions that death findings without pursuing a diligent search would deny them due process, the court acknowledged that some families want a dead-or-alive determination so that they can get over their grief and start life anew."

"To all of this, to be sure, there is no easy answer unless a new administration can persuade the Communists to live up to their obligations. What possible diplomatic leverage Washington might exert to insure an accounting for the missing and repatriation of the dead, we cannot guess. But surely, so long as any hope still flickers that any of these missing may still be alive and captive, the government should withhold writing them off as dead unless either new evidence or the expressed wishes of their families so warrants."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Speaking for the committee, we are very grateful for the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. As we know, he is supporting the bill. We appreciate that.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 57, line 20, strike the figure \$5,388,000 and insert in lieu thereof the figure \$7,648,000.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the manager of the bill, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, and the distinguished chairman (Mr. STENNIS). I also commend the distinguished Republican member (Mr. TOWER). I commend them for the fine work that they always do on the military procurement bill, the military construction bill, and the various military

S 16398

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 11, 1974

authorization bills that come before their committee.

I commend them for their determination that we shall always have a strong defense posture in this country. Certainly, providing for a strong national defense should be our No. 1 priority. If we do not provide for the defense of our country, it will not be long before we do not have any country to defend.

At the same time, Mr. President, I support their efforts to save funds in such areas as they are able to save, in areas where construction is not necessary, where armament is not necessary, where economies can be effected.

It is somewhat unusual for the Senator from Alabama to be suggesting an increase in an authorization or an appropriation. I am somewhat hesitant in making this request for this increase because I respect the dedication, the ability, and expertise of those leaders of the committee and the full membership of the committee that has these matters come before them.

The fact of the matter is that this amount suggested in the amendment, and I shall be more specific in a moment, was suggested by the Army. This comes under the appropriations for the Army Materiel Command.

The request was made in the House. The House committee approved the figure that is contained in the amendment. The House voted the amendment. But the Senate committee, in its wisdom, saw fit to make a reduction.

What is involved here is the construction of a headquarters building at the Anniston Army Depot near Anniston, Ala. The amount involved is \$2,260,000.

What is the Anniston Army Depot? It is a tremendous installation we are proud to have in our State. I might say that this installation and the employees there have the full support of the community. It is an installation that is important to the economy of the entire area. As a matter of fact, some 4,200 persons are employed at this installation.

What does it do? Several hundred acres of this reservation contain literally thousands of concrete reinforced igloos where shells are stored. The other phase of its mission is that it is a tremendous factory or repair shop. You might say, for all manner of military armament, going from small weapons on up to 50-ton tanks. It is a busy installation.

They have no headquarters building there, even though they have a tremendous operation. For the last 30 years they have been in a renovated warehouse. That is what they have had for a headquarters building.

Since it is doing such an important service for the Army and for the Nation, and so many people are involved there—as I stated, some 4,200 people—various dignitaries come from all over the world to see the operation there at Anniston. High-ranking military officials, high-ranking officials in the Government, visit there, and they have no adequate headquarters building.

So the Army saw fit to request this

building and the House approved it. Now it is before the Senate.

I have inquired of Senator SYMINGTON, Senator STENNIS, and Senator TOWER if they felt that the public interest would be served if this amendment be accepted here on the floor of the Senate, and that this installation would be allowed to go ahead.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama knows of our respect for him and our respect for his knowledge of military matters. We have discussed this question among ourselves. It is a fact that the money requested for this addition was considered a matter of lower priority by the Army. Nevertheless, because of the able presentation of the distinguished Senator from Alabama I would request that, rather than introduce the amendment at this time, he withdraw it and, inasmuch as it has already been passed in the House bill, that we take it to conference, with his thinking on the matter.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I am sympathetically inclined toward the proposal made by the Senator from Alabama. I feel that perhaps we should maintain the current integrity of the bill, so to speak, and look with some favor on this matter when we get to conference.

As the saying goes we would like to have a little head room in the conference.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the generosity of the distinguished Senators in their comments. I appreciate their attitude. I recognize that they would want to support the action of the committee.

As I have stated, I hate to go against their recommendations. But I do not believe that this is an unreasonable request.

I might state that my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. SPARKMAN, joins me in this effort. He is not able to be in the Chamber at this time because he is chairing an important hearing of his committee, but he thoroughly endorses the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Ralph W. Callahan, dated September 3, 1974, and a letter from Mr. Harvey C. Norton, dated September 4, 1974.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANNISTON STAR.

Anniston, Ala., September 3, 1974.

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: We have been much distressed at the news that the Senate has deleted from the military construction bill the \$2.8 million item for a headquarters at Anniston Army Depot at Bynum.

It is my understanding that this item was in House Bill No. 16133 and, of course, it very shortly will go to conference.

For over thirty years now the Depot has been using a converted warehouse for its headquarters and at present has approxi-

mately 180 people working in the headquarters building while it is forced to disperse some 75 other headquarters' personnel in seven outposts on the installation.

I'm sure you realize how much more efficient the operation could be if the Depot could centralize its operation with all its people in one modern headquarters building.

I do not have to tell you how important the Depot is to this area since it is the largest employer within the seven counties surrounding the installation, nor do I have to tell you what a top job they are doing for the Defense Department. Incidentally, some 3,000 visitors (including high-ranking U.S. military and civilian and foreign nationals) visit the Depot each year, and I sometimes wonder about their reaction when they are greeted in this old warehouse.

On behalf of the Military Affairs Committee and the Greater Anniston Area Chamber of Commerce I earnestly solicit your assistance in seeing that this item is restored in conference.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. CALLAHAN.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Bynum, Ala., September 4, 1974.

HON. SENATOR JAMES ALLEN,
New Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been informed that a project passed in the House to provide the Anniston Army Depot with a much needed and desired Headquarters and Administration Building has been deleted in the Senate.

Senator, as you know, the Anniston Army Depot is one of the largest and most productive organizations in the defense of our country. Our great depot located in the great State of Alabama is being called on to produce more and more tanks, just one of the things we do so well and more efficiently than any other Department of Defense activity. The Depot has in some skill areas as much as three generations and we are extremely proud of this heritage in the rebuild of many items of defense from small weapons to 50 ton tanks.

For over thirty years now, a converted warehouse has been used as a Headquarters Building at the Depot. While some depots and other defense establishments have boasted of modern Headquarters Buildings, the proud people at Anniston have improvised with available facilities within the converted warehouse and hoped for better facilities in the future.

The Anniston Army Depot is a top depot and should have a top Headquarters Building. The Depot is the largest employer within the seven counties surrounding the installation and is known throughout the world for their responsiveness to produce, and supply our troops as well as our foreign allies.

Approximately 3,000 visitors including high ranking U.S. Military and Civilians and foreign nationals observe this great Department of Defense activity each year.

Our depot needs this Headquarters Building, which I understand will be an item for discussion in the Senate-House conference on Military Construction. Therefore I strongly urge you to use your support and influence in our plight for this project.

On behalf of some 42 hundred Depot Employees and union members, I earnestly request your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

HARVEY C. NORTON.

President.

Mr. ALLEN. I recognize that no commitment has been made by the distinguished Senators who will be conferees on the bill; but with the understanding that they will check into the matter and

September 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16399

discuss the matter with the House conferees, and with the understanding that some consideration will be given by the conferees to the subject involved in the amendment, I do withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. President, I should like to mention and make a record concerning an acquisition of real estate in the State of Colorado described in the committee report as the "Fort Carson land acquisition request," on page 5.

I realize why the distinguished floor manager of the bill could not accept an amendment to delete this authorization, particularly in view of the fact that the House bill does not have it, and it will be taken to conference.

I should like to mention that when the appropriation bill comes up, if this item is in it, I will seek to have it removed.

I merely take this occasion to state the background of the problem, and in the hope that the distinguished floor manager of the bill, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, will bear the facts in mind when they go to conference and possibly decide to accede to the position of the House.

Basically, they only wanted a three-phase acquisition of land near Fort Carson, which lies between the city of Colorado Springs and the city of Pueblo. Phase 1 was for 17,500 acres and was adjacent to the southern boundary of Fort Carson. In phase 2, they only would acquire 45,400 acres adjoining the southeastern corner of Fort Carson. Phase 3 would permit the acquisition of 11,200 acres on the eastern edge of Fort Carson.

The purpose of the acquisition—that is, the Army's purpose, and it was so stated—was to provide additional maneuver room for mechanized units and to "simulate" the NATO environment.

I should mention, Mr. President, that the last expansion of Fort Carson was in 1965. At that time, the Army told the people of my State that there would be no further expansion.

The subcommittee very graciously held special hearings on this Fort Carson matter, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for so doing. After those hearings, a so-called compromise was proposed. The compromise was to permit the acquisition of phase 3—in other words, skipping over phases 1 and 2—and the bill authorizes \$7.2 million to purchase these 11,000 acres.

The compromise is not acceptable to the people who live immediately adjacent to the area, nor to the people of Pueblo, nor to a great many people in Colorado Springs, although those people do not feel quite as strongly about it.

One has to look at the problem of this entire acquisition as a totality; because, quite obviously, the acquisition of merely 11,000 acres is not going to be sufficient to do what the Army wants, which is to have a reservation big enough to deploy a division, as opposed to a brigade, in maneuvers. So the totality of the acquisition would effectively prohibit any ex-

pansion of the city of Pueblo, and the local citizens are vehemently opposed to the acquisition.

Furthermore, it seems to me that an authorization at this time is premature. The reason I say that is that the Army has published a draft environmental impact statement, as required by law. This was done in the middle of July of this year. But this impact statement has not been reviewed by the Environmental Protection Agency, it has not been reviewed by the Council on Environmental Quality, and—this is most important—it has not been opened and subject to public hearings.

Whether one is considering the environmental impact statement or is merely considering—I think this is of overriding importance—any expansion, I think the local people should be heard at hearings as to their feelings and opinions; because unless this is done, quite obviously, resentments build up that are not desirable.

Therefore, I stress that because of the absence of public hearings, either on the environmental segment or otherwise, and because we cannot look at phase 3 without looking at phases 1 and 2—because if you go into phase 3 to get the Army its purpose, you have to acquire phase 1 and phase 2—and because of the adverse effect that the total acquisition would have on the city of Pueblo, which has approximately 1,000 people, I hope that at the time of the conference the distinguished floor manager of the bill and the other Senate conferees would consider my position.

I point out that the committee report states this:

The major portion of the Army's justification for the land acquisition at Fort Carson was to support the training requirement of a mechanized division; a division that trains to fight primarily in the NATO area. While the committee is authorizing the funds necessary to acquire the Phase III land, it believes a mechanized division might better simulate the NATO ground environment at some other location.

In other words, the committee, itself, realizes that this terrain in Colorado is not comparable to NATO terrain and would not really be suitable to simulate NATO environment.

Therefore, in summary, I hope that in conference this matter will be reconsidered. I will try to prevent the appropriation because, frankly, this partial land acquisitions will not do what the Army wants. No. 1. No. 2, the total land acquisition, according to the committee's language, would not do what the Army wants. No. 3, the people in the immediate area affected by this are violently opposed.

I thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am interested in and impressed by what the able Senator from Colorado has stated. His position is clear. We have had correspondence in the committee on this matter.

This matter was not approved by the House, and the language of the committee report is as follows:

The committee notes that the major portion of the Army's justification for the land

acquisition at Fort Carson was to support the training requirement of a mechanized division; a division that trains to fight primarily in the NATO area. While the committee is authorizing the funds necessary to acquire the Phase III land, it believes a mechanized division might better simulate the NATO ground environment at some other location. Therefore, future fund requests, especially for the Phase I or II area, must be justified on the basis that other adequate training sites for mechanized units within the continental limits of the United States that simulate the NATO environment are not available.

I thought that the Senator from Colorado would be interested in that part of the committee report.

Mr. HASKELL. I appreciate the senior Senator from Missouri underscoring that, and under these circumstances, I hope that the distinguished Senator will at least consider whether it is right at this moment to authorize phase III if, really, the totality is not going to be desirable.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a few minutes. I want to make some additional remarks about the bill, particularly this Diego Garcia aspect.

Mr. President, the Director of the CIA, Mr. Colby, testified before our subcommittee on this matter, and I notice that certain segments of the press undertook to play up what they called a rift, or a dissension, or a great disagreement between the military part of the Government and Mr. Colby. That is unmistakably the meaning of what some of them said. But, Mr. President, that is a great disservice to the military segment of our Government and to Mr. Colby.

What he said and what happened just do not justify, I submit, any such conclusion. Even though as late as this morning and until an hour ago, they were calling me, wanting me to comment upon this alleged rift between the CIA's Mr. Colby and the military. There is just nothing to it, Mr. President. There is no such animal as that running around in Washington now. There are a lot of different things running around, but certainly that is not one of them.

I want to say with all the emphasis that I can that Mr. Colby was trying to testify and did testify truthfully. He gave some of his estimations, and maybe some of them verged on military matters. With all deference to him, and I am friendly to him, my estimation and some of them verged on military matters may not be worth a great deal. They are somewhat out of our field. But at the same time, he is not taking any licks at the military, and they were not taking any licks at him, so far as I know. I just wanted to comment on that, Mr. President.

I wish to say one other thing too, about this whole concept of the Indian Ocean. I think it is a broad policy question and it has some military aspects. I shall be glad when the Congress has fully disposed of the matter. I think we ought to proceed and dispose of it. But, Mr. President, there are important aspects of this Indian Ocean problem aside from any military concern about it. They are spelled out in one short, three-letter word, a very short word, O-I-L, oil.

Out of this area north of the Indian Ocean at the Persian Gulf comes more than 80 percent of the oil that supplies Japan, certainly an ally of ours. Through the same Indian Ocean comes about 50 percent of the oil that supplies Western Europe and England, certainly, overall, a major ally of ours. Through this same Indian Ocean is going to come, by 1985, according to the estimates, about 20 percent of our own oil supply. It is around 10 percent now from the Middle East.

So, entirely apart from any so-called military significance—immediate military significance—I am thoroughly convinced—and I did not let the Navy come and brief me on this matter until I had looked into it some myself—that we had better be alert to be sure that we not get caught short in the whole vast area of the world there. We have to have better facilities for the operation of our Navy, the Navy we already have in that vast area of the world, and will have as long as we continue to be internationalists, so-called, as is our policy.

I have never been a fanatic on it, but we cannot withdraw into a shell. Our economy is so dependent on exports and imports, we are not going to be withdrawing into a shell any time soon. We are not going to solve our own energy sources problem in a few years. I am an appropriations subcommittee with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. BIBLE), who is here in the Chamber and compliments me by listening to me. He and I know that we are not going to solve this energy sources matter in 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years. We are going to have it with us, at the very best, for a good number of years.

We heard all of this on the Committee on Appropriations. I should not advocate that we use up all our oil just to be independent of the Middle East anyway, unless we have to.

So, I am vitally concerned that we have the facilities there—a pier and oil storage, fuel storage, and the things that have to go into operating a Navy—that might be needed to protect our oil supply lines.

This is the route that they will come, no mistake about that, these huge oil tankers. They will never be able to use the Suez Canal.

At present fuel and repairs and supplies and everything to this Indian Ocean area have to come all the way from the Philippines. It is over 3,000 miles, anyway, to keep supply ships going back and forth.

If a carrier over there has to be replaced, or go in for repairs or for rest of the crew, there is all this distance involved. Therefore, I am convinced that if we fix up the facility there on Diego Garcia, we can far better utilize the Navy we presently have.

We read a lot about that this is going to cause us to have to build more carriers, more supply ships for the carriers, and other carrier forces. I do not believe there is a word of truth in that. There may be other reasons that will cause us to have to do that, but I am sure we can better utilize the carriers, supply ships, and carrier forces that we already have—utilize and operate them better—by having something out there in the middle of the Indian Ocean.

The island is a thousand miles or more from any shoreline. I hope we can get some kind of reasonable agreement from Great Britain, and I believe we will, and proceed on with the elemental needs for this naval installation there. I believe that is the course that we will follow, and that we will obtain an agreement. I had thought we ought to have it by now, but matters came up that they could not do it. We will thus, as I say, be augmenting, reinforcing, and making more operative the Navy we already have.

I wish we could have this oil problem go away, but it is not going away. We will have to deal with it.

So far as the money is concerned, we have reduced this appropriation to \$18.1 million, rather than the \$33.2 million that was requested by the Defense Department, and I commend the Senator from Missouri on that figure. The Navy has assured me over and over that they are not planning and do not expect to make any further requests above the \$29 million, except for about \$5 million additional that will be necessary to properly round out this matter and provide something more in the nature of adequate quarters, and so forth.

We can go on to talk about what is going to happen with reference to the Soviet Navy, and all, but these are the fundamentals. I think that we are on the right track to get an agreement and then go on with financing these matters with reference to Diego Garcia.

I support the proposal on that basis, Mr. President.

The Defense Department has, from time to time, requested the construction of a support facility at Diego Garcia. During the past few years Congress has approved over \$20 million in military construction funds for an austere communications facility at Diego Garcia.

Of this year's \$29 million Navy request, \$14.8 million was approved for construction of a new pier, extension of the existing runway from 8,000 feet to 12,000 feet, oil storage facilities, power-plant expansion, and substation and subsistence building addition. The full \$3.3 million request was approved for the Air Force to provide additional ramp space, oil storage, and open munitions storage.

The committee approval of a total of \$18.1 million represents a 44 percent reduction in the Defense request of \$32.3 million. The authorization of these funds will allow the Navy to construct a modest support facility for a carrier task force and naval air reconnaissance operations. The facilities are strictly logistical in nature, permitting limited import upkeep and resupply.

U.S. INTERESTS IN THE INDIAN OCEAN

The United States has long had substantial interests in the Indian Ocean.

We have been dedicated to the growth and well-being of the area. For many years the U.S. Navy in the Indian Ocean has been a visible source of support to our friends there and represented a U.S. commitment to deter aggressive activities by outsiders.

The United States also has a substantial interest in the petroleum resources of the Middle East. The increasing importance of energy sources to the world's economies and the embargo of the recent Middle East war have highlighted the value of the Middle East petroleum reserves. These reserves constitute over 60 percent of the world's proven crude oil reserves. It has been estimated that Europe depends on the Middle East for 50 percent of its oil supply; Japan depends on the Middle East for over 80 percent of its oil supply. This severe reliance of our allies on uninhibited access to the Middle East petroleum resources makes the support facility of Diego Garcia particularly critical.

The Arab countries themselves should view the expansion at Diego Garcia as a friendly move which could help protect their product—oil. Iran and Saudi Arabia have not objected to the proposed expansion.

The demand on Middle East oil will continue to accelerate in the foreseeable future. The United States presently receives about 10 percent of its oil from the Middle East. If the present trend in U.S. energy demand continues and U.S. oil production continues to decline as it has since 1970, the United States may well have to depend on the Middle East for 20 percent of its oil supply by 1985, or approximately 129 million barrels per month.

The routes for transporting oil from the Middle East will remain through the Indian Ocean. The opening of the Suez Canal will not eliminate the necessity to transport oil through the Indian Ocean since the canal cannot accommodate some 70 percent of the tonnage of all modern oil tankers.

At the present time the U.S. Navy must depend on the Subic Bay as its supply station for Indian Ocean operations. The base is over 5,000 miles from the Persian Gulf. To operate from such a distance puts a severe load on our Navy which has already been spread very thinly.

The expansion of Diego Garcia will underline the U.S. interest in the peaceful development of the Indian Ocean area. At the same time the expansion at Diego Garcia will signal the U.S. determination to assure the access to and transporting of the crucial petroleum resources of the Middle East.

SOVIET ACTIVITY

A wealth of intelligence information on the Indian Ocean area was provided to the Armed Services Committee. As might be expected, intelligence estimates differed on the precise extent of Soviet military activity in the Indian Ocean area. There was unanimity among intelligence estimates, however, that the Soviet military presence has been steadily increasing in the Indian Ocean area and will probably continue to increase. Without going into the technicalities of

September 11, 1974

how to define and measure military presence or military bases, it is clear that the Soviet Union has a significance entrée and capability for military activity in the Indian Ocean.

JUSTIFICATION FOR DIEGO GARCIA EXPANSION

In noting the steadily increasing Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean, Mr. President, I do not intend that this Soviet activity be the primary justification for expanding our support facility at Diego Garcia. An extended base at Diego Garcia is necessary to protect U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean. It is for our own needs and our own use.

The authorization of the \$18.1 million for the proposed facilities at Diego Garcia does not imply a new or expanded role for U.S. forces in the Indian Ocean. Deployment of U.S. forces will depend on future developments. I, for one, hope that the United States never needs to deploy substantial military forces in the Indian Ocean.

The proposed facilities at Diego Garcia will be consistent with a low U.S. military profile in the Indian Ocean. These facilities will be located on a deserted island almost 1,000 miles from the nearest coastal country.

The Soviet Union has its own interests in the Indian Ocean area. They will continue to pursue these interests regardless of what the United States does in the Indian Ocean area. The United States can have no assurance as to Soviet intentions, and should not sacrifice its own interests in anticipation of Soviet behavior. I would like to emphasize Mr. President, that there is nothing in the proposed expansion at Diego Garcia which is provocative toward the Soviet Union. Diego Garcia will not in any way be a base for U.S. strategic operations. Rather it is a support facility which will give the United States a tentative connection to the Indian Ocean area.

In short, the United States has significant interests in the Indian Ocean—particularly since most of the oil of the industrialized free world must pass through this area. A small support station at Diego Garcia would facilitate efforts to protect U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me, and I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in considering section 612 of H.R. 16136, let me say from the outset that I have been vigorously opposed, and remain so, to any increase in authorized expenditures for expanding our present so-called limited communications facility on Diego Garcia.

Earlier in the year, the Senate was asked in supplemental S. 2999 to authorize \$29 million to expand this facility into a naval and air base. I immediately

introduced an amendment to strike this item in its entirety from the bill.

Why? Because I was convinced that this comparatively modest request for funds adumbrated a major departure from our established policy of a low military profile in the Indian Ocean.

Because it was not justified by any proven threat from Soviet military forces in the area.

Because it could lead to a costly United States-Soviet arms race in the Indian Ocean at a time when hard-pressed humanity is already staggering under an annual world bill of some \$230 billion for military purposes.

Because its *raison d'être* appeared chiefly related to establishing a permanent U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean at what I believe to be an eventual cost of multibillions of dollars to the U.S. taxpayer.

I believe these reasons are as valid now as they were then.

My amendment to S. 2999 never came to a vote because the Armed Services Committee wisely decided to eliminate the \$29 million from that supplemental bill and reconsider the issue in connection with the 1975 military construction bill now before us as H.R. 16136.

Section 612 of the bill pertaining to Diego Garcia is represented as a compromise between the pro and con forces on the expansion issue. The original \$29 million is essentially cut in half to \$14-802,000 for naval construction, plus, however, \$3.3 million for work requested by the Air Force.

Before these funds can be obligated, section 612 requires that the President certify that the construction is "essential to the national interest," with such certification subject to approval by both Houses of Congress in a joint resolution.

Since this legislation provides an opportunity "for full debate on the expansion of Diego Garcia as a policy matter, and in the light of the most recent circumstances," I am refraining at this time from introducing an amendment to strike the proposed \$18 million for Diego Garcia in 16136.

However, let me state that if the President should certify that the expenditure of this sum for Diego Garcia is essential to the national interest, I will make every effort to persuade the Congress that this Presidential judgment is in error.

At this point, I call attention to a statement in the Armed Services Committee report—page 6, Diego Garcia—naval support facility—stating that the original \$29 million "would allow the base at Diego Garcia to become a general support facility for U.S. forces operating in the Indian Ocean and, in particular, would have the capability to support a carrier task force."

I would like to know if the \$18 million S. 16136 calls for is considered as the initial step to obtain this same objective? That broad question embraces specific subsidiary questions such as:

Does the administration wish to establish a permanent U.S. carrier task force in the Indian Ocean?

If so, would not this action entail maintaining our aircraft carrier strength at 15 instead of reducing it to 12 as Con-

gress was originally told was the Pentagon intention?

What would be the cost of three new carrier task forces to replace the three that would otherwise be eliminated if the carrier strength were reduced from 15 to 12 as originally planned?

Would not this cost be in the \$10 billion range—some \$3 billion for each carrier task force?

If this is not our costly intention, why are we pressing for even a limited expansion on Diego Garcia that is bound to arouse Soviet suspicions and antagonize our close friends in the general area—Iran, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand?

I raise these questions now since the replies are very pertinent to the ultimate decision made to expand or not to expand on Diego Garcia. Under section 612, the President can decide that the proposed construction is not in the national interest. I believe that the facts and circumstances of this question give him every justification for concluding that it is not. If he does not so decide, then the Congress should by disapproving of his certification under section 612.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services has approved H.R. 16136, the military construction authorization bill for 1975 with an amendment providing for congressional approval, by joint resolution, of further expansion of the Diego Garcia naval and air base facility in the Indian Ocean.

As the committee correctly pointed out:

By increasing logistic flexibility and capability, expansion of the Diego Garcia base is a distinct step in facilitating U.S. operations in the Indian Ocean and thus is directly related to the broader policy questions associated with a U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean.

It has long been my own view that such policy questions must be resolved by Congress pursuant to its constitutional role in approving treaties. In this respect, there is no conflict in usage between treaties and other international agreements, as the American Society of International Law recently pointed out. The society went on to state that:

No international agreement which itself assumes significant international obligations or otherwise determines important policy issues should be concluded without congressional participation.

Last year I introduced legislation to the State Department authorization bill requiring approval by Congress of all major military base agreements. The Senate approved this amendment, it was accepted in conference, but unfortunately it was deleted on the House floor on a point of order.

Again this year the Senate approved an amendment I introduced on this year's State Department authorization bill. It would prohibit spending to carry out any agreement between the United States and any foreign country: First, establishing a major military installation for U.S. troops; or second, renewing, extending, or significantly altering the terms of any such agreement, unless Congress approves the

agreement by law, or, if a treaty, the Senate advises and consents.

The Senate also approved, on the same bill, an amendment I proposed requiring congressional approval of any expansion of facilities on Diego Garcia. Earlier that amendment was approved unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The action taken by the Senate Armed Services Committee is, in all essential respects, identical to the language already approved by the Senate on the State Department authorization bill. It has my full support and, I know, it will have the support of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I urge approval by the full Senate of this most important matter. It is an important step in restoring the authority of Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill, H.R. 16136, authorizes \$18,200,000 for the first increment in the construction of expanded Navy and Air Force facilities on the island of Diego Garcia. Before this money is spent, however, the bill also provides, in section 612, for the President to reevaluate all the military and foreign policy implications involved in establishing these facilities. He must certify in writing that this action is essential to the national interest, and he must submit this certification to the Congress for approval by both Houses. Although I remain firmly opposed to the establishment, at this time, of a logistic support base on Diego Garcia—without first exploring every avenue of possible negotiation with the Soviet Union—I recognize that the committee has taken note of the serious long-term foreign policy issues involved in this action, and deferred a final congressional decision.

For some time I have been deeply concerned by the possible emergence of yet another arms race with the Soviet Union, this time in the area of the Indian Ocean. In March, I introduced, with Senator PELL, Senate Concurrent Resolution 76, asking the President to seek direct negotiations with the Soviet Union, regarding an agreement on mutual limitation of forces in the Indian Ocean. I am pleased that the Armed Services Committee, in its report on H.R. 16136, has expressed its hope that the President will explore this possibility.

Traditionally, the position of the United States toward the Indian Ocean has been to maintain the sound policy of caution, restraint, and minimal military involvement. In authorizing these funds, we would be clearly committing ourselves to expanded deployments of our military forces in the Indian Ocean. We would be establishing the basis for a semipermanent U.S. presence in the area. And we would be signaling that the fledgling arms race with the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean is about to become a serious affair.

Before committing ourselves to these actions, we should have absolute assurance that all possibilities had been exhausted of reaching a mutual agreement to exercise restraint, in the interests of both countries. At the same time, it is imperative that we carefully examine the facts to determine whether the threat from Soviet presence is serious

enough to warrant the steps being taken. To do otherwise is to ignore the lessons which history teaches, concerning the endless cycle of regional power conflicts, and to give up any hope of preserving a relatively low military profile in that area, consistent with the desires of the littoral states as expressed in two U.N. resolutions declaring the region a "zone of peace."

If these reasons alone do not cast sufficient doubt on the wisdom of proceeding with this project at this time—and I believe they do—then the widespread disagreement within our own government about the need for this facility clearly does.

President Ford has already made his views on Diego Garcia clear, in his press conference 2 weeks ago. He stated then that he was in favor of the expansion of facilities on that island, and that he did not view this as any challenge to the Soviet Union because the Russians already had "three major operating bases in the Indian Ocean."

The Soviet news agency Tass suggested 2 days later that perhaps the President had been "misinformed by his staff." They maintained that "there are neither three nor even one Soviet naval base in the Indian Ocean." It was important, therefore, to determine the facts. When the White House was asked to name these "three major operating bases," inquiries were referred to the Pentagon. The Defense Department then disclosed that the Soviet bases the President had referred to were located at Berbera, Somalia, Umm Qasr, Iraq, and Aden in Southern Yemen.

It is apparent that there is some confusion within the executive branch over the extent of these installations and whether or not they should be called bases. In his testimony last July before the Senate Armed Services Committee, on the request for authorization of these funds, Mr. William Colby, Director of the CIA, gave a different interpretation of the significance of these Soviet facilities:

Berbera: A small installation which will handle two or three ships . . . They have been building an airstrip there for about a year, but have not gotten very far.

Umm Qasr, Iraq: The so-called port is about four, five or six buildings here—a place where you can anchor . . . The Iraqis appear to be a little bit restrictive as to the degree to which they will allow the Soviets free use of this particular port.

Aden, Southern Yemen: The Soviets have not used it very much. They have not done much more than port visits there.

In his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Rear Admiral Grojean, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations cautioned us that:

We have to watch the word "bases" here because the Russians do not have bases per se.

Similarly, an enormous array of statistics have been presented to Congress by the Pentagon, to show that the increased Soviet presence is serious enough to warrant taking actions which have the effect of making our military presence in the area semipermanent. We have seen charts showing that the number of Soviet naval ship-days exceeds American ship-days in the Indian Ocean by more than 4 to 1. But a careful read-

ing of the footnotes discloses that a large proportion of the Soviet ship-days were accumulated by auxiliaries, supply vessels, and minesweepers used for a harbor clearing operations in Bangladesh.

Despite the appearance, according to some observers, of a wide disparity in naval deployment, the Director of the Politico-Military Policy Division of the Navy Department testified in July that:

The U.S. presence in the past several months has been greater than the Soviet.

At the same hearing, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs disclosed that, at that time, both the Soviet Union and the United States had eight combatant vessels operating in the area. The Soviet Union was deploying destroyers, cruisers, and escorts, while the United States was deploying destroyers, escorts, and the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk*.

Seymour Weiss, Director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State, testified that in terms of port calls during 1973, the Soviet Union made 150 visits to 9 littoral nations, while the U.S. Navy made 184 visits to 17 nations.

As justification for expanding the Diego Garcia facility, we have also heard the Pentagon's judgment that the re-opening of the Suez Canal will lead to sharply increased Soviet naval activity in the Indian Ocean, because of improved access for Mediterranean and Black Sea fleets. At the same time, however, Mr. Colby offered the judgment of the CIA that the opening of the canal will "increase the overall flexibility of the Soviet Navy in the Indian Ocean, but not in itself cause a significant increase in the Soviet presence."

Because of these differences of opinion within the administration concerning the Soviet role in the Indian Ocean—present and future—I trust that any Presidential determination pursuant to section 612 will clarify these issues, and bring the true facts before the Congress. We simply must not rush unthinking into another arms race with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, over the years we have often seen the wisdom in many parts of the world of reaching back to the historical traditions of American military policy. This is a tradition of naval power, which has helped permit projections of power where essential to our security, but also has helped to keep us from becoming involved where that is not in our interests. Ships afloat can perform this dual role. If necessary, they can be involved. But by eschewing fixed bases in a far-flung zone of difficulty, they retain the flexibility of remaining aloof.

I believe that expanding the facility at Diego Garcia would violate the second part of that important dictum. It would permit greater flexibility of naval operations, but at the price of signaling, in advance, that the U.S. Navy is involved. It will increase the chances that we will be drawn into local crisis and conflict. And it will likely stimulate a reaction, both by littoral and outside naval powers. Far better, in my estimation, for us to continue operating whatever naval forces may be required by our national interest at any time, from the existing base at Subic Bay. In particular circum-

stances, this could cost more in the short term. But in the long term, the costs are likely to be far smaller, both in overall involvement, and in the risks of unwanted combat.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons, I have grave doubts that the United States should proceed with expanding the Diego Garcia facility at this time. Therefore, I support the qualification in section 612 of this bill, and trust that the administration will provide us with all the pertinent information we must have, before asking the Congress to give final approval to this venture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to section 612 of the committee amendment, on the issue of Diego Garcia. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 389 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Abourezk	Domenici	Mathias
Aiken	Eagleton	McClellan
Allen	Eastland	McClure
Bartlett	Ervin	McGee
Beall	Fannin	McGovern
Bennett	Gravel	McIntyre
Bentsen	Griffin	Metcalf
Bible	Gurney	Metzenbaum
Biden	Hansen	Mondale
Brock	Hart	Montoya
Brooke	Hartke	Moss
Buckley	Haskell	Muskie
Burdick	Hatfield	Nelson
Byrd	Hathaway	Nunn
Harry F., Jr.	Hollings	Pastore
Byrd, Robert C.	Hruska	Pearson
Cannon	Huddleston	Pell
Case	Hughes	Proxmire
Church	Jackson	Randolph
Clark	Javits	Ribicoff
Cotton	Johnston	Roth
Cranston	Kennedy	Scott, Hugh
Curtis	Magnuson	Scott
Dole	Mansfield	William L.

Sparkman
Stafford
Stennis
Stevens
Stevenson

Symington
Taft
Thurmond
Tower
Tunney

Weicker
Williams
Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Baker	Fong	Long
Bayh	Fulbright	Packwood
Bellmon	Goldwater	Percy
Chiles	Helms	Schweiker
Cook	Humphrey	Talmadge
Dominick	Inouye	

So section 612 of the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which section 612 was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 16136.

The main thrust of this bill is in the area of housing and other support facilities for military personnel. Also included are projects for upgrading existing medical facilities and for the construction of new facilities.

It is my firm belief that to maintain a strong defense posture and to achieve an all-volunteer force we must supply adequate support facilities for our military personnel.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and his colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for reporting out a bill which is supportive of the continuation of our defense posture and which is at the same time acceptable in relation to our fight against excessive Government expenditures and inflation.

Accordingly, I intend to vote in the affirmative and I recommend that my colleagues do likewise.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATHAWAY). The bill is open to further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment, as amended, and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY),

and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 390 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken	Fannin	Montoya
Allen	Gravel	Moss
Bartlett	Griffin	Muskie
Beall	Gurney	Nelson
Bennett	Hansen	Nunn
Bentsen	Hart	Pastore
Bible	Hartke	Pearson
Biden	Haskell	Pell
Brock	Hatfield	Proxmire
Brooke	Hathaway	Randolph
Buckley	Hollings	Ribicoff
Burdick	Hruska	Roth
Byrd	Huddleston	Scott, Hugh
Harry F., Jr.	Jackson	Scott
Byrd, Robert C.	Javits	William L.
Cannon	Johnston	Sparkman
Case	Kennedy	Stafford
Chiles	Long	Stennis
Church	Magnuson	Stevens
Clark	Mansfield	Stevenson
Cotton	Mathias	Symington
Cranston	McClellan	Taft
Curtis	McClure	Thurmond
Dole	McGee	Tower
Domenici	McGovern	Tunney
Eagleton	McIntyre	Weicker
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams
Ervin	Mondale	Young

NAYS—3

Abourezk	Hughes	Metzenbaum
----------	--------	------------

NOT VOTING—15

Baker	Fong	Inouye
Bayh	Fulbright	Packwood
Bellmon	Goldwater	Percy
Cook	Helms	Schweiker
Dominick	Humphrey	Talmadge

So the bill (H.R. 16136) was passed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to H.R. 16136 and request a conference with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the

Chair appointed Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. TOWER, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. DOMINICK, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to express the appreciation of the Military Construction Subcommittee and all its members for the fine work that has been done by Mr. Clark McFadden, who took the place of Mr. Nease, who unfortunately became ill a few days ago. It is only because of Mr. McFadden's hard work and that of other members of the staff that we have been able to present the bill today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AMENDMENTS OF 1974

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATHAWAY). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 3934, which will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3934) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with Title 23 of the United States Code and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for debate on this bill is limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between and controlled by the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), with 1 hour on any amendment, 30 minutes on an amendment to an amendment, and 20 minutes on any debatable motion or appeal.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I hope it will be with the approval of my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. RANDOLPH, and the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD)—that there now be 15 minutes, not to be charged against the time on the bill, to be allotted as follows: 5 minutes to Mr. CRANSTON, 5 minutes to Mr. BROOKE, 5 minutes to myself. This allocation of time would be so that we could speak on a matter that is not germane to the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 400—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE GRANTING OF EXECUTIVE PARDONS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am going to submit a resolution together with Senator BROOKE, who is joining me in this matter, and I will ask that it be placed on the calendar. Failing in that, I will then ask for its immediate consideration. I want to make clear, however, that we have no desire to bring the resolution to a vote until Senators have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it.

I hope, Mr. President, we can work out an agreement, when an agreement becomes possible, to vote on the resolution, say, Tuesday of next week.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States of America is a nation of laws and all persons in the United States are subject equally to its laws and institutions;

Whereas a public fully informed about events, situations, or ideas of public concern or public interest or which affect the public welfare is essential to the principles as well as the effective operation of a democracy;

Whereas public confidence in and respect for our system of order and justice under law is vital to the maintenance of our free institutions;

Whereas that public confidence and respect depends upon the equal application of our laws to all persons;

Whereas the offenses and alleged offenses known as "Watergate" have constituted an enormous breach of public trust and confidence on the part of officials of Government;

Whereas a part of Watergate is its alleged coverup which has deprived and continues to deprive the American people of the full information they require and to which they are entitled in our democracy;

Whereas "Watergate" will thus continue to pose a grave crisis for the American people and the Government of the United States until there is a reasonable assurance that all of the facts related thereto have been publicly revealed;

Whereas the President of the United States has chosen to pardon Richard M. Nixon for all offenses against the United States which he has committed or may have committed or participated in as President of the United States without a full exposition of his involvement in Watergate and related offenses or prior to the opportunity for the judicial process to be initiated, let alone completed, with respect to the guilt or innocence of the former President of any such offenses against the United States;

Whereas various matters are currently under investigations or in various stages of prosecution by the Special Prosecutor pursuant to regulations of the Attorney General of the United States—including matters related to "Watergate", other alleged offenses arising out of the 1972 Presidential election, and other offenses alleged to have been committed by Presidential appointees or members of the White House staff;

Whereas public confidence in the integrity of the nation's system of order and justice under law will be seriously undermined if the investigation and prosecution of such allegations of illegal acts by officials of Government do not proceed in accordance with the orderly and normal course of the criminal justice system and judicial process; and

Whereas any further action by the President of the United States at this time to pardon any defendant or prospective defendant with respect to such matters could abort the normal and orderly course of the criminal justice system and the judicial process and thereby destroy that public confidence and deprive the American people of the full information they require and to which they are entitled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the grant of a pardon under section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States should not be considered until after the judicial process has been fully completed (including the exhaustion of all rights of appeal with respect to a criminal investigation and prosecution referred to or within the jurisdiction of the Special Prosecutor under Attorney General's Order 517-73 (May 25, 1973) and Attorney General's

Order 551-73 (November 2, 1972), or with respect to other matters which have been or shall be assigned to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the resolution speaks for itself. The whereas clauses are based on considerations of equal justice under law, and the public's right and need to know, in our democratic society and its free institutions. The reason for our urgency stems from the unprecedented action by the President in regard to the pardon of Richard Nixon without any significant consultation with a broad spectrum of leadership in the Senate.

The resolution stems, furthermore, from the statement yesterday by the White House spokesmen that the President was considering granting a blanket pardon to all the Watergate defendants or people under the cloud of Watergate, and the further statement today that, instead, pardons are being considered on an individual basis. These statements indicate that something may happen rather hastily. For that reason, we feel it appropriate to seek action now.

Therefore, I send this resolution to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed on the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. CRANSTON. There was an objection to the resolution being placed on the calendar. Because of that, I asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont did not object. If it is agreeable with the Senator from California, he will withdraw any reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STAFFORD. That it be placed on the calendar?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, may I be recognized for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a time limitation.

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield, if I have time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. For the purpose of clarification, is it the fact that under the unanimous-consent request which was made by the Senator from California, the parliamentary situation is the same as though he had asked for immediate consideration and there had been objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is essentially correct.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I should like to explain again, in case the distinguished Senator from Michigan did not hear me, that I did not want immediate consideration. I think that would be totally unfair. I hope we can work out an agreement for action, perhaps next Tuesday.